Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-067
Monday
8 April 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-067 CONTENTS *8 April 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Moiseyev Discusses Soviet Security *[IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* 1
INF Verification Commission Amends Procedures *[TASS]* 4
Military Observer Views Interest in SDI *[Moscow International]* 4
Nuclear Weaponry Undermines Security *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 4
Radio Urges Middle East Arms Supply Cuts *[Moscow International]* 5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

NATO Role in Europe Labeled 'Anachronism' *[TASS]* 7
CSCE Legislative Assembly Viewed *[TASS]* 7
Asian Security Issues Discussed in Vladivostok *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Apr]* 8

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Post Gulf Investment Leaves USSR Behind *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* 9

China

Ivashko Meets Beijing Mayor Li Ximing *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 10
Sino-Soviet Negotiations Round Begins *[TASS]* 11

Northeast Asia

Rogachev Talks With Delegates at ESCAP Meeting *[TASS]* 11
  Meets ROK Foreign Minister *[Moscow International]* 11
UN Group Views Asian-Pacific Security Problems *[TASS]* 11
Commentary Views Military Tension With Japan *[Moscow International]* 12
Kuril Islands Problems, Solutions Eyed *[PRAVDA]* 13

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Yanayev Receives SRV Assembly Delegation *[PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 15
CPSU Group Returns From Lao Party Congress *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 15
Prospects of Cambodian Peace Talks Assessed *[Moscow International]* 15

Near East & South Asia

PRAVDA Comments on UN's Resolution on Iraq *[5 Apr]* 16
TASS Urges UN Measures on Iraq 'Genocide' 16
Commentary Views UN Resolution on Gulf War *[Moscow International]* 17
Kurdish, Iraqi Citizens' Suffering Detailed *[Moscow International]* 17
Arab Journalist on Solution To Mideast Issues *[Moscow Radio]* 18

Sub-Saharan Africa

Yazov Meets With Officers Released by EPLF *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Apr]* 19
Continuing Role Seen for African Commission *[IZVESTIYA 2 Apr]* 19

East Europe

- Paper Interviews Romania's Iliescu Before Visit *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 5 Apr]* 20
- Romanian President's 4-6 April Visit Reported 21
  - Met By Yanayev on Arrival *[TASS]* 21
  - Gorbachev, Iliescu Hold Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 21
  - Bessmertnykh Comments on Talks *[TASS]* 21
  - Gorbachev Talks Detailed *[TASS]* 22
  - Meets Yeltsin *[TASS]* 22
  - Holds News Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 23
  - ROMPRES Reports Conference *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 23
  - Moldova, Other Issues Discussed *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 24
  - Iliescu Departs 6 April *[TASS]* 25
  - Iliescu Interviewed After Visit *[TASS]* 25
- Polish Prime Minister Discusses Moscow Talks *[Moscow International]* 26

West Europe

- Falin Meets With Swedish Left Party Official *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 26
- Dzasokhov Meets Spanish Party Leaders *[TASS]* 27
  - Departs Madrid 6 Apr *[TASS]* 27
- General Staff Chief Receives Portuguese Envoy *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Mar]* 27
- TASS Commentator Views Soviet-German Treaty *[TASS]* 27

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

- Moscow TV Details 4 April Proceedings *[Moscow TV]* 29
  - Session Summarized *[Moscow TV]* 30
  - Criminal Law Examined *[TASS]* 31
  - Privatization Bill Deferred *[TASS]* 31
- Finance Team Reveals Dismal Budget Problems *[IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* 31
  - 'Extract' From Letter to Gorbachev *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Apr]* 33
  - Appeal to Republic Counterparts *[IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* 33
- Lukyanov Interviewed on Sessions' Work *[Moscow TV]* 34

Political & Social

- Pugo Cancels Appointment by RSFSR Minister *[TASS]* 34
- Moscow Soviet Chief To Ignore Militia Decree *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 35
  - Hunger-Strikers Appeal to Popov *[Radio Rossii]* 35
  - Deputies Support Komissarov Appointment *[Radio Rossii]* 35
- Union, Republic Foreign Ministers Meet 5 Apr *[TASS]* 35
- Yakovlev Interviewed on Yeltsin's New Powers *[Paris LIBERATION 5 Apr]* 36
- Ryzhkov Speaks Out on Gorbachev, Yeltsin *[London THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH 7 Apr]* 36
- Pavlov, Yeltsin Attend Easter Service *[TASS]* 38
- Gorbachev Makes Ministerial Appointments *[Moscow TV]* 38
- Paulman Appointed USSR Labor Minister *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 38
- Constitutional Committee Examines Legislation *[Moscow Radio]* 38
- Soviet Women's Committee Sends Letter to Pavlov *[TASS]* 39
- Kalugin Implicates KGB in 'Markov Affair' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 39
- PRAVDA Defends Nishanov From Attack in Press *[1 Apr]* 40
- Leading Officials Attend Perestroyka Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 40
- International Perestroyka Group Registered *[IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]* 41
- Implications of Rally's Suppression Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]* 41
- PRAVDA Article Provokes Martial Law Fears *[MOSCOW NEWS No 11]* 42
- Soyuz Deputies Launch 'Hard-Hitting' Paper *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Apr]* 43

Economic

Gorbachev Meets With Coal Industry Leaders *[Moscow TV]* ... 43
Over 40 Kuzbass Mines Remain on Strike *[Moscow Radio]* ... 43
    Three More Mines Join Strike *[PRAVDA 8 Apr]* ... 44
    Kuzbass Strikers Up by One-Third *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* ... 44
Strike Suspended in Inta, Continues in Vorkuta *[TASS]* ... 44
Donbass Miners Drawn Into 'Political Struggle' *[PRAVDA 8 Apr]* ... 44
Mining Situation 'More Complicated' Than Before *[Moscow TV]* ... 45
Coal-Mining Situation 'Remains Difficult' *[TASS]* ... 45
Normalization Process in Mining Areas 'Difficult' *[TASS]* ... 46
Miners' Reaction to Agreement Differ *[Moscow Radio]* ... 46
Resolutions on Miners' Pay Reported *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* ... 47
Gorbachev Exempts Certain Goods From Sales Tax *[Moscow TV]* ... 48
Bank Issues Notice on Deposits Compensation *[Moscow TV]* ... 48
Soviet Banks Change Ruble Exchange Rate *[Radio Rossii]* ... 49
Rules Changed To Keep Cafeteria Prices Down *[TRUD 5 Apr]* ... 49
Cabinet Issues Privatization Instructions *[Moscow Radio]* ... 49
First Deputy Prime Minister on Economy *[Moscow TV]* ... 49

Scientific

Gorbachev Greets Space Exhibition *[Moscow Radio]* ... 51
Three Satellites Launched 4 April *[TASS]* ... 51
Almaz Space Survey Station To Be Activated *[Moscow TV]* ... 51
Construction of 60 Nuclear Power Plants Halted *[Moscow International]* ... 52
Measures Against Chernobyl Radiation Hazards *[TASS]* ... 52

Military

All-Army Conference Issues Appeal to Communists *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Apr]* ... 52
All-Army Party Conference Resolution *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Apr]* ... 53
Navy Faces Budget, Conversion Issues *[Moscow TV]* ... 55

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

U.S. Senators Hold News Conference in Riga *[IZVESTIYA 5 Apr]* ... 61
Poll: Ruutel Favored by Estonians, Russians *[Tallinn Radio]* ... 61
Latvian Official Comments on 11 Apr Moscow Talks *[Riga International]* ... 61
'Great Difficulties' in Latvian Oil Supplies *[Riga International]* ... 62
Stankevicius Interviewed on Talks With Moscow *[Vilnius International]* ... 62
    Ozolas, Butkevicius on Talks *[Vilnius International]* ... 63
Lithuanian CP Charged With Unlawful Broadcasting *[Vilnius International]* ... 64
Landsbergis Views Vilnius-Moscow Negotiations *[Radio Vilnius]* ... 64
Property Privitization Begins in Lithuania *[TASS]* ... 65

RSFSR

Further on Final Russian Congress Session 5 Apr ... 65
    Moscow TV Coverage ... 65
    Prepares 'Commonwealth' Treaty *[TASS]* ... 67
    Goryacheva, Isayev To Remain *[TASS]* ... 68
    Yeltsin Gives Closing Speech *[Moscow Radio]* ... 68
    Russian Communists Assess Outcome *[TASS]* ... 71
    Yeltsin Calls Work 'Constructive' *[TASS]* ... 71
    'Text' of Congress Resolution *[TASS]* ... 71
    Yeltsin 5 Apr News Conference *[Moscow TV]* ... 72
    'Redistribution of Powers' Resolution *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Apr]* ... 77

- Official, Media Reaction to Congress Reported ... 78
  - 'Failure' in Resolving Problems *[TASS]* ... 78
  - Khasbulatov Sees Yeltsin 'Victory' *[TASS]* ... 79
  - Yeltsin, Ministers Discuss Results *[TASS]* ... 79
- Further on 4 Apr Russian Congress Session ... 79
  - Silayev Addresses Deputies *[Moscow TV]* ... 79
  - Further on Yeltsin 'Personality Cult' *[Moscow TV]* ... 80
- IZVESTIYA Views 3 Apr Congress Debates *[5 Apr]* ... 81
- Komissarov Named to Moscow Internal Affairs Post ... 82
  - Appointed Despite Decree *[TASS]* ... 82
  - Pugo Refutes Appointment *[Moscow TV]* ... 82
  - Hunger Strike Against Pugo Action *[Radio Rossii]* ... 82
  - Soviet, Russian Officials Meet *[TASS]* ... 83
- Center-Russian 'Accord' on Northern Territories *[Tokyo TV]* ... 83
- Gorbachev To Visit Khabarovsk Japanese Cemetery *[TASS]* ... 83
- Miners Continue Strike Despite Pavlov Talks *[TASS]* ... 84
- Moscow Students Demonstrate for Grants, Food Aid *[TASS]* ... 84
- Moscow Soviet Votes To Establish Militia *[Radio Rossii]* ... 84
- Moscow Executive Committee Reviews Prices *[Moscow Radio]* ... 84
- Thousands Rally To Defend Tatar Sovereignty *[Moscow Radio]* ... 85
- Vladivostok 'Fully Satisfied' With Goryacheva *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Mar]* ... 85
- Press on 'Communists of Russia' News Conference *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Mar]* ... 85
- North Ossetia's Galazov Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Apr]* ... 86

Western Republics

- Majority in Georgia Vote for Independence *[Moscow Radio]* ... 87
- Belorussian Capital 'Rocked' by Protests *[IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* ... 87
  - Strike Demands Detailed *[Moscow TV]* ... 88
  - Strikes Subsiding in Minsk *[TASS]* ... 89
- Dnestr Republic Enacts Law on Government *[Moscow TV]* ... 89
- Belorussian Law on Indexation of Incomes *[cross-reference]* ... 89

Caucasus

- Ossetian Killed as Georgians Fire on Tskhinvali *[TASS]* ... 89
  - Scene Around Tskhinvali Described *[Moscow Radio]* ... 89
  - Violence Continues *[Tbilisi Radio]* ... 90
  - Situation 'Extremely Tense' 90
- Azerbaijan Officials' Helicopter Shot Down *[Belgrade TANJUG]* ... 90
- Kirghiz Communist Leader Released From Post *[TASS]* ... 91
- Georgian Draft Law on Economic System *[cross-reference]* ... 91

Central Asia

- Turkmen SSR Approves Draft Union Treaty *[TASS]* ... 91
- Various Kazakh Laws Published in Press *[cross-references]* ... 91
  - Law on Foreign Economic Activities ... 91
  - Law on Consumer Cooperatives ... 91
  - Law on Free Economic Zones ... 91
  - Law on Foreign Investment ... 91

Moiseyev Discusses Soviet Security

PM0704174591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 91 Union Edition p 6

[Article by Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister: "Problems of Security: A Considered Approach Is Needed"]

[Text] Thoughts of the country's security have been suggested by recent events. The war in the Persian Gulf region is over. The Warsaw Pact's military structure has ceased to exist, as has, in fact, this entire organization. We remain alone against NATO, without allies. The treaties and agreements concluded last year on a German settlement have come into effect. All our troops will have returned home to their own territory before the end of 1994, and there will no longer be a so-called defensive "buffer zone."

A new situation has arisen. In the assessment of U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney, "the West has scored a tremendous strategic success" in strengthening its influence over the countries of Europe. Are all these special features taken into consideration in our security? Are we acting correctly in adhering to the former line with regard to the creation of a nonbloc system of European security? Will the country's security and defense not be weakened? These are natural questions. I will express some views on this.

I.

First of all, about the nonbloc system of European security. In my view, corrections are needed on this question. The forecasts relating to the transformation of the two alliances—the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO—and their dissolution in the new all-European structures of collective security are not fully being realized. The Warsaw Pact states alone have fulfilled their obligations. The taking of an analogous step by the NATO countries is problematic. Whereas the question of the nonbloc system of European security was among the first items on the agenda after the Paris summit meeting, now, after the war in the Persian Gulf, it is being postponed indefinitely. Its realization is not perceived in the foreseeable future.

Maybe we are mistaken in our assessments; for NATO, too, is not immortal, specialists declare. The loosening of its structures is a matter of time and external conditions. If there is no Warsaw Pact Organization, why is the North Atlantic bloc needed? Against whom do its members intend to fight in Europe? Against the Soviet Union? But Moscow and the capitals of the West now take similar stands on many issues, jointly striving to ensure peaceful conditions for all peoples and their security.

All this is so. However, the leaders of the North Atlantic alliance follow a different logic. They readily proclaim the bloc's politicization and express readiness to build a new united Europe and joint security within the CSCE framework. At the same time, they are working in practical matters to strengthen the NATO bloc, including its military organization. The leadership of the alliance makes it rigidly clear that the question of NATO is not subject to revision and that the North Atlantic bloc must be preserved. Voices in defense of NATO started to be heard in a particularly categorical manner after the war with Iraq. "It is absolutely essential to preserve NATO's might," U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney declares.

Various reasons are given for preserving the alliance as a military organization: the possible emergence of armed conflicts like the Iraqi one, the growing threats from the spread of nuclear and missile technology, the unstable situation within the Soviet Union, the long-term possibility of the secretive revival of the united Germany's powerful military potential. Under conditions of a multifaceted threat, in the opinion of the alliance's leadership, NATO alone can ensure European security.

In principle, there is nothing unnatural about such views. Europe is essentially going through a transitional period of security. The thinking of many figures is still under the influence of the war in the Persian Gulf. Something else is strange, namely the way Western leaders see the future of the North Atlantic alliance. They would like the alliance to play the leading role in the new world order throughout the planet, and they would like to extend the alliance's sphere of activity outside the treaty zone of responsibility.

Things seem to be moving toward not a diminution but an increase in the NATO bloc's military role. A decision has not yet been adopted in the alliance; but questions are arising even now. Does NATO really intend to be some supranational, global organization and assume the role of a world gendarme? Then what will be the worth of Western leaders' statements about a "new order" in Europe? How are such actions to be squeezed into the framework of observance of the norms and principles of the Paris conference? How is guaranteed equal security for all to be ensured? Finally, what place in this situation is allocated to the Soviet Union? No solution to these questions is in sight.

It seems that the new order in Europe which is replacing the "cold war" must differ fundamentally from the present one. The Paris conference laid the foundations of this order. At the same time it is obvious that equal security will not be obtained by preserving NATO's military organization. The asymmetry factor will always be present and, depending on the situation, will have one destabilizing effect or another. There will always be doubts and concerns about security and about attempts by the other side to converse from a position of strength and to exert pressure. A new rivalry could emerge.

Collective European security structures of at least 34 states could be a worthy alternative to bloc confrontation. The substance of such structures is multifaceted.

They are set forth in concentrated form in the "Charter for a New Europe." It is now necessary to act and to advance toward the planned goals by preserving equilibrium and stability and not infringing the Soviet Union's interests. If the members of the alliance, following the guidelines of the 1990 London Declaration, were to begin transforming it into an exclusively political alliance, it would be possible to speak even now of a fundamental change in NATO's functions.

This is not happening. Despite changes in the European climate, the NATO members are not venturing to break up the bloc's military structures. They are trying to preserve the basic principles of their strategy: to strengthen the alliance, to rely on force and nuclear deterrence, to maintain the armed forces' ability to have a quick and effective impact on conflicts and crises which arise in the world, to participate in the disarmament process on terms advantageous to themselves.

In building the armed forces, priority is given to achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union, primarily by utilizing the latest technology. Strategic offensive and defensive forces and air- and sea-launched tactical nuclear weapons are being developed, and an adequate number of U.S. forward-based forces is being preserved. The bloc's conventional forces will evidently be switched to multinational formations and will possess great strike power and be highly mobile. An increase in the combat potential of the air force, the navy, and the rapid deployment and strategic redeployment forces is expected. All this is characteristic, in the main, of an offensive, not defensive, strategy.

This is the situation. We are far from dramatizing it and rushing to extremes. But the situation objectively obliges us to weigh our state interests anew in connection with the preservation of NATO's military organization as a force opposed to the Soviet Union. Now we must obviously rely not on illusory nonbloc security but on the organization of the country's defense independently, within national borders. We are capable of resolving this task. Certain guarantees are provided by the Paris documents and the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe. It is important now to define how best to ensure our security interests in relations both with NATO and with the countries of East Europe. How are we to prevent NATO troops from ending up on the USSR's western borders? It seems that our actions must be based not on military opposition and confrontation but on cooperation and trust, a treaty-legal settlement, and the peaceful development of the all-European process.

With regard to the NATO countries, the treaties the Soviet Union signed last year with France, the FRG, and Italy are essentially nonaggression pacts and can serve as an example. They are valuable insofar as they create a good basis for broad cooperation in very different spheres. They promote the building of new security structures, the demise of closed military-political groupings, and the elimination of the chief cause of conflict: military confrontation. Maybe precisely this path will better provide us with a guarantee of peace and enable us to live without fear in a stable and secure Europe.

As for the East European countries, our interests in the sphere of security can be ensured quite reliably by means of bilateral cooperation. The foundations for this are laid in the new treaties and agreements with Hungary, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. The texts of the corresponding documents are being prepared. We are working to ensure that the "former concord" does not turn into discord, unfriendliness, and a source of hostile anti-Sovietism and that the territory of these countries is not used, given any development of events, to station foreign armed forces or military bases and installations. I believe the East European countries are also interested in good-neighborliness with the Soviet Union and in stable military security.

II.

Our approaches in the disarmament sphere are being sharply criticized in the new situation—they supposedly do not take account of the elimination of the Warsaw Pact's military structures, Germany's unification within NATO, or the Soviet troop withdrawal from central European countries. In fact, this is not so. All questions are resolved in an interrelated way, from the position of ensuring the country's reliable security. Our policy in the disarmament sphere is aimed at lessening military confrontation and reducing armed forces and arms on a mutual basis. We favor getting away from the arms race, conducting the disarmament process in all areas, and making it continuous. I am sure that, on the whole, this policy accords with the Soviet people's interests and leads to stronger stability and universal security.

But it is not easy to defend and implement this policy. Many factors—economic, sociopolitical, psychological, purely military—have to be considered. It is necessary to take into account pacifist sentiments, whose holders try to suggest to people that because the "cold war" is over, the era of universal peace and prosperity has supposedly already arrived, that no one will attack us or has any intention of doing so, that the Army is not needed and must be reduced, including unilaterally, and that state sovereignty can supposedly be defended by political means.

I believe that such an ideal has not yet arrived. Yes, military tension has diminished. The threat of war has receded. But it has not been consigned to the archives. The large-scale conflict in the Persian Gulf shows that the ending of the "cold war" does not remove entirely the danger of war. It persists, just as the gamble on force and pressure persists. The international situation remains complex. There are crises, rivalry, clashes of interests and forces, and all kinds of global and regional contradictions which might be fraught with wars and conflicts.

Overt U.S. claims to the role of world leader are being renewed. "Today, in a rapidly changing world, America's leadership is necessary," President Bush declares.

The Pentagon's leader speaks of the same thing: "Peace and stability throughout the world will depend, as before, on the might and determination of the United States and on our readiness to ensure an active presence throughout the world where our interests and our allies' interests are threatened." The obsession with leading world development pushes the United States toward attempts to secure military superiority and to demonstrate its superpower status in relations with the Soviet Union.

All this must be taken into account. Questions of the country's security must be resolved without emotion and realistically, and they must be constantly "verified" through the prism of Soviet-U.S. relations and USSR-NATO relations. We must defend our legitimate state interests responsibly. We must lower the levels of military confrontation on equal terms, without undermining defense capability. Precisely this approach is enshrined in the Soviet position at the talks on disarmament topics.

For example, let us take the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe. Its chief substance is the decisive curtailment of the arms race and huge reductions in the most destabilizing weapons systems. Forty months after the treaty's ratification and thereafter the collective arms levels of each of the groups of states (the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO) must not exceed 20,000 tanks, 20,000 artillery systems (100-mm caliber and above), 30,000 combat armored vehicles, 6,800 combat aircraft, and 2,000 attack helicopters.

Of the total quantity of arms and hardware which all states within the area of the treaty's application will be left with after the reductions, the maximum arms ceilings for the USSR (in accordance with the agreement signed by the Warsaw Pact countries in Budapest on 3 November 1990) in the European part will be as follows: 13,150 tanks, 13,175 artillery pieces, 20,000 armored vehicles, 5,150 combat aircraft, and 1,500 attack helicopters. That is, the highest national arms levels are being set for us, compared with other countries, which compensates to some extent for our country's changed strategic position following the elimination of the Warsaw Pact's military structures.

The Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe is now being discussed and analyzed actively in connection with its upcoming ratification. The majority of Soviet specialists believe that the treaty was drawn up on the basis of regard for mutual interests, sensible compromises, and the sides' identical security and that it is balanced, removes disproportions, and eliminates potential for carrying out a surprise attack and for launching large-scale offensive operations in Europe. All this, in our view, accords with reality in principle.

But what do Western experts think? In their assessments they unequivocally tend to think that the signed treaty is of greater benefit to the NATO countries, since all their demands have been achieved in full and this is precisely the result that the West had been persistently seeking. They emphasize that the USSR is eliminating more arms and that the correlation of military forces following the cuts will change in favor of the North Atlantic alliance, while the unprecedented monitoring and notification measures will enable it to assess the Soviet Armed Forces "as from an open book." They consider the resolution of the following questions a victory for Western diplomacy: the inclusion of paramilitary formations (troops of the Ministry of Internal Affairs; the KGB; and the Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy) in the overall arms levels; the limiting of land-based naval aircraft, regardless of carrier-based aircraft; the NATO countries' securing of the opportunity—to reach the ceiling of 6,800 combat aircraft—not only not to destroy a single aircraft but even to increase their numbers to the restricted level.

What objections can be made to such assessments? We really are reducing more ground-based arms, since we have more of them. Verification of compliance with the provisions of the treaty really will be unprecedented, but in equal measure for both sides. The correlation of ground-based military forces between the USSR and NATO after the reductions will be roughly 1.5:1 in NATO's favor (1.5 to 1 for tanks, combat armored vehicles, and artillery and 1.3:1 for combat aircraft and attack helicopters). Some people believe that NATO's 50-percent superiority supposedly "does not run counter to the criterion of minimum sufficiency for defense, proceeding from our defensive doctrine."

Such statements are, to put it mildly, far from the truth, as scientific criteria for minimum sufficiency have not yet been formulated. Therefore there is no point in consolidating an asymmetrical arms reduction by means of farfetched criteria and giving out big advances in the disarmament process. It would be more correct to reckon that the national levels of conventional arms set for our country in the signed treaty, combined with a strong nuclear shield, ensure the guaranteed fulfillment of defensive tasks under any conditions of the situation.

Nonetheless, why did we agree to conclude a treaty requiring a greater arms reduction by us? We did so because the treaty generally accords with our strategic policy of relieving Europe of a huge quantity of arms, dismantling everything that the "cold war" piled up, and creating on a new basis a system of collective security that is equal for all. Chiefly it was for lightening our own military burden, helping the country to extricate itself from the economic crisis, and raising Soviet people's living and everyday conditions.

Are we achieving these aims? I believe we are. The economic and social consequences of the treaty will be very great. It is hard at present to name the real benefits. But there is no need to doubt that they will be weighty. The military map of Europe will change. Very soon it will look quite different from what it was two or three years ago: from the viewpoint of the number of troops, their structure and location, the creation of groupings, the intensity of combat training, and so forth. Under these new conditions the Treaty on Conventional Forces in no way infringes our security. Its ratification and practical realization are advantageous to everyone, as a real material basis is created for improving the situation on the continent and in the world as a whole.

The current attempts by certain countries, owing to a discrepant understanding of Article III of the treaty (rules for counting), to suspend its ratification and to slow down the further advance of the disarmament process have been occasioned not by some unilateral actions or interpretations by the Soviet Union. The deep-down reasons lie elsewhere—in the categorical refusal of the United States and NATO to take appropriate steps in the sphere of reducing naval arms and in the desire to make us—to compel us to—agree to an unjust position which runs counter to our interests. We are ready to seek solutions. Our compromise proposal on this score has been conveyed to the U.S. side. Will there be a constructive response to it and then ratification will take place, or will the signed Paris treaty become a hostage of Washington?

As regards our security, it is reliably ensured and is determined by the Soviet Union's immutable foreign policy course, including in the disarmament sphere. The guarantee of this is the reform of the Soviet Armed Forces, their transfer to a new qualitative condition, and the imparting of a new look to them on the basis of sufficiency for the country's defense.

INF Verification Commission Amends Procedures

LD0604115791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1727 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Vitaliy Makarchev]

[Text] Geneva, 5 Apr (TASS)—The 10th session of the Soviet-U.S. Special Verification [kontrolnyy] Commission (SVC), set up in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. treaty on eliminating intermediate missiles ended in Geneva today.

During its work on 4 April, M.N. Streltsov and Steven E. Steiner, representatives of the USSR and the United States in the commission, signed two amendments to the memorandum on the accord applying to the verification provisions contained in the treaty on intermediate-range missiles. The memorandum on verification is the basic document envisaging the procedures and equipment for fulfilling the provisions of the treaty concerning on-site inspection.

The first amendment concerns the use by U.S. inspectors of a system to determine whether the missiles transported from the inspection site in Votkinsk are RSD-10 (SS-20) missiles restricted by the treaty.

The second permits U.S. and Soviet inspectors to have with them dosimeters for the purpose of personal medical monitoring during the inspections.

The two amendments to the memorandum on verification are the fifth and sixth documents connected with the fulfilment of the treaty on intermediate-range missiles which have been prepared and signed in the SVC.

Military Observer Views Interest in SDI

LD0204230291 Moscow World Service in English 1910 GMT 2 Apr 91

[Commentary by military observer Colonel Vadim Solovyev]

[Text] In the United States, discussions have renewed about the Strategic Defense Initiative as a shield capable of protecting the country against potential nuclear attacks, and demands can be heard, even in Congress, for a review of the superpower anti-ballistic missile treaty, the ABM. Our military observer, Colonel Vadim Solovyev, tries to explain why:

The main reason, says Vadim Solovyev, is that it was felt Patriot anti-missile missiles used to intercept by now obsolete Iraqi Scud missiles during the Gulf war are incapable of fighting modern long-range missiles. This is being clearly dismissed by SDI supporters. However, the deployment of Star Wars plan will be in breach of the 1972 ABM Treaty, whose implications go still far beyond the framework of superpower relations.

For this part General (Fedorov Ladygin) of the Soviet Chief of Staff speaks of a linkage between the ABM Treaty and the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty yet to be signed: Should the ABM Treaty be reviewed or renounced, the move will totally wreck any basis for further START treaty talks. General (Ladygin) said the most dire implication was a runaway nuclear arms race, something that must be realized by Soviet partners at the negotiations as well.

Nuclear Weaponry Undermines Security

PM0504145591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

["Viewpoint" article by Professor Aleksandr Migolatyev: "Security Paradoxes"]

[Text] I think many people will agree that the appearance of nuclear weapons and modern delivery systems—particularly strategic systems—was a decisive factor in changing people's views of international, regional, and national security. There are more of all sorts of weapons in the world, but less security. Has this been recognized by everyone? States have been striving for decades to strengthen their position by means of the arms race and a demonstration of their military superiority. As a result, mankind, having amassed "mountains of weaponry," has become hostage to them. Collective efforts to seek peace have been systematically undermined by paroxysms of violence.

The paradoxes of security have primarily affected the world's strongest powers: the USSR and the United States. By the mid-eighties they had amassed an inconceivable strategic nuclear megatonnage of 11.3 billion tonnes of explosive—more than 2 tonnes for each person on earth. What was the result? Both countries acquired many times over the potential for MAD—mutually assured destruction. And precisely as a consequence of this, their security in nuclear-missile terms was not assured. Indeed, can peaceful, safe development be considered to be assured if weapons capable of wiping out all life on the face of the earth are in existence?

Security cannot be reduced to military factors. That is essentially axiomatic. But how far off is the time when we will finally be able to say a farewell to arms! Today, in my view, only irresponsible politickers or anti-Army circles could advocate that there be no limits to the reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces' might, or call the Soviet defense complex "monstrous." In today's overarmed world, not having your own army would be tantamount to signing your own death warrant.

The Gulf War and the breakup of the Warsaw Pact's military organization converged from different directions to focus on a single point: NATO. Indeed, virtually all the allies in that bloc joined the United States in opposing Iraq. The troops and naval forces of the NATO alliance made up the backbone of the multinational forces in the anti-Iraq coalition. Primarily NATO weapons—mainly U.S., British, and French weapons—were used. And although the NATO leadership did not make a decision to go to war (each state within the bloc took part in the war on the basis of national decisions), there is no doubt about the synchronized nature of the allies' actions, which made their military contingents subordinate to the commanding general, N. Schwarzkopf.

For many years the Western side in Europe held forth about a united, nonbloc, all-European security system. But when the Warsaw Pact took that path, NATO engaged in a rapid "restructuring." First, North Atlantic circles immediately stated that NATO was not planning to disband and would continue its activities. Second, it was asserted that the NATO bloc itself, not the Helsinki process, should become the main European security system. Bearing in mind that NATO's nuclear deterrence strategy remains in force, how should the Soviet Union react to all this? In what direction will the USSR's priority relations with the United States—the leading country in the Western military-political alliance—develop? The fundamental vital interests of the two countries and the international community as a whole require that these relations be based on the principles of peaceful coexistence.

It is also clear that many new aspects have emerged in the USSR's geopolitical, military-strategic, and domestic situation. The circumstances obviously demand difficult measures commensurate with the situation in the security sphere and corresponding to the amendment of the country's positions in the disarmament sphere. I think, however, that the frightening incantations about the unilateral abolition of Warsaw Pact military structures and the development of disarmament processes hardly deserve any serious attention. I am sure that life will show that our former allies have created far more problems for themselves than they have for the Soviet Union.

May I be so bold as to put forward the following recommendation: We should not rush into signing bilateral military agreements with former Warsaw Pact members. Time will tell just what the contents of such agreements (treaties) should be, and when, with whom, and on what basis they should be concluded.

There is one other point which I cannot fail to mention. Unfortunately we have many politicians, academics, deputies, and specialists in our country who pay lip service to sovereignty and independence but actually ignore the internal aspects—unrelated to military might—of national security, without which state sovereignty is no more than a phantom or a myth. Reliable security is impossible without a highly effective and integrated economy, without advanced science, information, hardware, and technology, outside of a renewed unified USSR, without democratic change, social strength, and political stability in society, without sound moral foundations for the people, and without high conscientiousness and discipline among the masses.

It is only in a dialectical combination of these components and elements of security that we will be able to ensure favorable prerequisites for solving our difficult problems—both now and in the future.

Radio Urges Middle East Arms Supply Cuts

LD0504163791 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] On 4 April President Gorbachev had a talk with the Syrian Foriegn Minister Faruq Shar'. The talk covered, among other issues, problems of a postwar settlement in the Persian Gulf and in the Middle East as a whole. The two sides underlined that if a genuine settlement and peace were to be achieved, a military relaxation had to be brought about. Yuriy Solton elaborates:

The resolution just adopted by the United Nations Security Council provides for an actual dismantling of the Iraqi huge military machine. It urges Iraq to destroy, under the United Nations supervision, the entire stock of its bacteriological and chemical weapons and also its ballistic missiles with a range of more than 150 km. Baghdad is banned to buy or develop nuclear weapons.

The resolution also reaffirms a ban on the deliveries of any weapons to Iraq from the outside. It means that Iraq, which scared its neighbors, fought against Iran and captured Kuwait, will cease to exist as a powerful militaristic state in the region. Consequently a hotbed of tension and military danger will be closed.

But other hotbeds are still there. The main is the Arab-Israeli conflict, with the Palestinian question lying at its core. There are quite a few differences between Arab countries that also lead armed clashes [as heard]. It is an open secret that tension in that region that resulted, apart from small conflicts, in eight major wars was fed on the supplies of weapons from the outside. These weapons were coming from the United States, Britain, France, West Germany, and China. The Soviet Union, too, sent its impressive consignment to the region.

The Gulf war, however, has revealed that Iraq is not the only country in the region that should be demilitarized. All agree that this should be done in relation to Iraq. But there have appeared other alarming facts. Israel, for example, gets from the United States more than half a bilion dollars to meet its military needs. Saudi Arabia was promised part of the heavy weapons that the United States had moved to the region in view of the conflict between Iraq and Kuwait. There is a plan to sell $1.6 billion worth of arms, including combt planes, to Egypt. Forty attack aircraft of the F4-E class have already arrived in Turkey as part of the package of American military assistance. No restraint is shown by other suppliers of weapons to the Middle East and Southwest Asia.

Does this all mean that the arms race and the military confrontation will continue?

Moscow believes that there is a need to consider in earnest balanced and reduced weapons deliveries to the region. Restraint should be shown first and foremost in relation to offensive weapons, particularly missiles and missile technology. All kinds of mass destruction weapons should be prevented from spreading in that region. A zone free from them should be set up there. After all, all the Middle East countries have joined in the nuclear non- proliferation treaty and also in a convention banning chemical weapons now in a state of preparation.

NATO Role in Europe Labeled 'Anachronism'

LD0504164991 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS international analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—Addressing a press conference in Copenhagen, NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner said that the North Atlantic Alliance favoured the creation of new security structures in Europe, embracing the Soviet Union, the East European countries and the neutral states.

At first glance, Woerner's proposal looks like the beginning of a serious initiative. But, unfortunately, this impression disappears when it is studied more attentively.

Woerner says that new security structures could be set up either within CSCE frameworks or under the aegis of the European Community or the West European Alliance. The word "or" is quite embarrassing in this case. Why does Woerner equate the CSCE, on the one hand, with the European Community and the West European Alliance—on the other. The Paris "Charter for a New Europe", adopted last year and signed by leaders of all the NATO states, envisages the creation of a new collective security system within CSCE frameworks.

Moreover, as far as I know, the European Community does not claim to play the role of a "roof" for an all-European defense alliance. If, in light of plans to set up a political alliance, the community of 12 West European states is now discussing the problem of vesting the EC with certain military functions, this must be regarded as a private problem, concerning nobody but the said alignment. Calls heard in Brussels to turn the West European Union into a component part of the European Community should apparently be viewed in this context.

In other words, the CSCE, as we see it, is now the only all-European structure that could solve problems of European security. This is becoming even more possible in light of the Warsaw Treaty initiative to abolish its military structures. This allows us to make concrete steps towards a new security system in Europe which will not be based on any blocs. Hence, Woerner's claims that NATO should remain the backbone of the planned all-European defense alliance appears to be an outright anachronism.

The abolition of Warsaw Treaty military structures makes many people regard in an absolutely different light NATO's role as the only military alliance still remaining in Europe. It would be logical to expect new approaches to the problem of security, since Europe is turning a new page of its history. It is absolutely obvious that the epoch of military blocs is receding into the past. Only the CSCE is able to guarantee the security of all its members, to ensure a new balance of their interests and a military equilibrium. Moreover, no military blocs will be needed if the continuing disarmament process within CSCE frameworks finally culminates in the reduction of military potentials to reasonable minimum ceilings.

Woerner's terms for NATO's cooperation with the USSR and for "settling problems of the Baltic republics" seem very strange and are obviously unacceptable. It is worth reminding Mr. Woerner that Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia are parts of the Soviet Union and their difficulties in relations with Moscow are a purely internal affair of the USSR, which will be solved in keeping with our Constitution.

CSCE Legislative Assembly Viewed

LD0404173991 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 4 Apr 91

[By TASS news analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—Parliamentarians from 32 countries of Europe, the United States and Canada made a decision of great historic importance in the Madrid Palace of Congresses last night—they agreed to establish a parliamentary assembly of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

The assembly is designed to become a political institution to build a common Europe home. Delegates from the CSCE member-states also decided to form a secretariat of the assembly and hold the first session of the new CSCE body in Budapest in July, 1992.

The idea to create a parliamentary assembly is not new. It was recorded in the Paris charter for a new Europe. It is important that this idea was not brushed aside but realised. Noteworthy is the unanimity with which the decision to set up the new CSCE body was adopted. On the other hand, the birth of the assembly is a clear proof of parliamentarians' enhanced role in handling crucial issues of the modern-day world. The move signifies, first and foremost, that parliamentarians are prepared to assume a new and more substantive responsibility for implementing plans to build a common house for all European peoples.

The creation of the European parliamentary assembly confirms that the Helsinki process will continue to deepen and that it will proceed in an atmosphere of constructive work and goodwill, mindful of the interests of all partners.

Although various difficulties may arise, the establishment of the assembly will certainly make it easier to resolve many issues, which, in turn, will help avoid confrontation and build one more road to greater trust, mutual understanding and cooperation.

Many delegates believe that the assembly will help solve the most serious problems of building a common European home. These are problems involved in the creation of a system of collective security. This task can be accomplished by advancing the complex disarmament process.

Although the threat of a conflict has diminished in Europe, there are other perils to the stability of European states, specifically encroachments on democratic institutions, independence, sovereign equality and territorial integrity.

The assembly could, in this regard, adopt a vigorous stance against all kind of unlawful actions, including outside pressure, coercion and subversive activity, and help some or other CSCE member-country cope with emerging problems.

The appearance of the CSCE parliamentary assembly on the European political scene is a major event in building a fair and lasting peace architecture in a future single democratic Europe, which is aware of its special role in ensuring stability and peace in the world. This architecture will be based on the priority of human rights, the supremacy of law and new political thinking in the development of inter-state relations.

Asian Security Issues Discussed in Vladivostok

PM0704153191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 4 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "On the Agenda—Mutual Understanding"]

[Text] Vladivostok—Issues of security in the Asia-Pacific region and possibilities for reducing the tension between the major states are being discussed at a quadrilateral meeting of the UN Associations of the USSR, the PRC, Japan, and the United States opening in Vladivostok.

The agenda includes global topics such as the effect of political and strategic changes in USSR and U.S. foreign policy on stability in the region and the growing role of Japan and China in this. Issues of the development of missile weapons inside and outside the Asia-Pacific region and their nonproliferation on the Korean peninsula will also be discussed, and arms control measures in Asia will be analyzed in the light of the change in East-West relations.

The special importance of this meeting being held in Vladivostok on the eve of the Soviet-Japanese summit was noted by the head of the Japanese delegation, Professor Masashi Nishihara of the National Defense Academy Social Sciences Department. The neighbor countries, he believes, must achieve greater mutual understanding in the military respect and must have precise and trustworthy information about this.

United States & Canada

U.S. Post Gulf Investment Leaves USSR Behind

PM0504150191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 91 Union Edition p 6

["Political Observer's Opinion" by Stanislav Kondrashov: "Financial Repercussions of the War"]

[Text] In 1989 the United States sold to other countries weapons worth $11 billion, while this year, according to some estimates, it will sell weapons worth $33 billion. "President Bush, as far as can be judged, is thirsting to reopen the Near East arms bazaar," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes editorially. Trade is good thanks to the impressive publicity the Americans got from the war in the Persian Gulf.

The missile and bombing strikes against Iraqi troops lasted five weeks and the ground operations just four days and nights, but long-term dividends are expected, and the demand for U.S.-made arms is now rising as the demand for Soviet weapons—defeated and disgraced, as it were—falls as a result of the antipublicity in the same war. Just try and prove that it was not the tanks or submachine guns that were bad but the Iraqi soldiers and officers who were fighting or, more accurately, not fighting. While you are proving it (if you can prove it at all), Soviet arms traders will be incurring superlosses, and the Americans will be making superprofits.

In addition, America, where military spending is being reduced too, now has somewhere to send its surplus arms, thereby easing the smooth conversion of the U.S. military-industrial complex. There are new complications for our military-industrial complex with its own conversion, now being botched. Last year 130 foreign currency rubles [R], i.e. of the order of $200, were made from sales of military goods abroad for every R100 of internal expenditure. This helps the consumer market to some extent, as well as the position of defense industry enterprises, having received a proportion of the currency deductions. This eases the burdens of conversion and the maintenance of a high standard of technology. It cannot be said that this source of support has entirely dried up. There is evidence that in the light of the lessons of the armed conflict in the Persian Gulf our traditional and potential purchasers are scratching the back of their head over whether to buy. The change in the situation is also being felt by those people in Moscow who, by virtue of their office, keep their hand on the control panel of the arms trade. "We must look into it," you hear them say.

It is immoral to trade in death and even to discuss the complications that have suddenly arisen in this trade, maximalist moralists will say. I agree with them in principle, and I would agree entirely if interstate relations were built from moralistic maxims alone. It is immoral and dangerous to sell weapons to dictatorial regimes, but we sent them to just such regimes in the Arab East—to Iraq, Libya, Syria. Incidentally, the norms of the new political thinking operate here too, and the overall atmosphere of tension in the world is already manifesting itself in the reduction of both military spending and military purchases.

India, for example, is buying fewer Soviet weapons. The changes in East Europe and the collapse of the Warsaw Pact's military organization have caused a cave-in in this respect too. The instant switch to payments in hard currency has resulted in a further decrease. As for Iraq, with its debts to the Soviet Union of the order of $6 billion, it stopped repayments last August after our role in the joint opposition to its aggression in Kuwait had been determined.

Informed sources report that in the 1986-1990 five-year plan the Soviet Union sharply reduced arms sales abroad, although it still remained the world's leading supplier, selling weapons worth R56.7 billion, that, at the official exchange rate, is more than $68 billion—the total of U.S. sales during the same period. However, we did not, of course, attain the NATO countries' combined indicators: Together they sold arms and military hardware worth $150 billion.

The dynamics of recent years are still more revealing. Last year Soviet sales totaled R9.7 billion—40 percent less than in the year before last (approximately R14 billion). A reduction by a further 35 percent is expected this year.

The Americans' growth curve has almost reached its zenith. Thus, the combination of Moscow's fully conscious policy with the action of factors beyond its control means that it is time for home-grown critics of the "trade in death" to transfer their fire from targets at home to transatlantic targets. Washington combines calls for a reduction in weapons deliveries to the dangerously explosive Near East with a sharp expansion in deals to sell them to the same region. Moreover, to encourage possible buyers, the Bush administration is demanding a special subsidy of $1 billion from the U.S. Congress. At the expense of U.S. taxpayers. This is the first time recourse to such a practice has been made since the seventies.

With regard to morality the Americans have not altered their former practice: Render to God the things that are God's, render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. To the god of patriotism has been rendered the ecstasy of victory, and to the caesars of the corporations have been rendered multibillion-dollar contracts to rebuild Kuwait. In accordance with the right of the victors, the Americans have grabbed approximately three-fourths of the sum total of the contracts. The weekly TIME writes that official Washington—and Bush personally—sought this lion's share from the Kuwaiti rulers in advance, months before the start of "Desert Storm." A Californian construction giant—the Bechtel Corporation—stands apart with superb links to Washington's upper crust. It is undertaking to extinguish fires and rebuild Kuwaiti oil wells—bringing home an income on the order of $6 billion.

In addition, when fighting, the Americans know how to safeguard not only the lives of their soldiers (having lost one man for approximately 1,000 Iraqis) but also their fiscal dollars. According to official data, the entire operation, starting in August, cost the United States $47.5 billion, but its allies pledged to set aside $54.4 billion to cover the U.S. costs, i.e. there is a possible surplus of $7.4 billion. They—Germany, for example—are now being pestered uninhibitedly in the U.S. Senate, which is demanding that payments be speeded up and threatening, otherwise, to suspend the delivery of the arms due to them. Japan, promising more than $10 billion, is being criticized sharply in America for not participating actively enough in the war and, in the U.S. opinion, for not forking out very generously for it.

There is another topic to ponder regarding Germany: Bonn vowed to pay Washington approximately $7 billion for the undoubtedly massive yet brief military operation in the Arabian sands. This is just a little less than what Moscow will receive for the act of withdrawal from Germany, which is historic for the Germans, and for settling in the motherland the almost 400,000 Soviet servicemen (more than 600,000 people including civilian employees and family members) who had been stationed on the territory of the former GDR for over 40 years. And, to judge from a recent statement by the commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces, we would like (would dream!) to receive just $1 billion there for the entire immovable infrastructure we are leaving behind. What modesty of aspirations! And I do not think anyone has a clear idea of how much has been forked out there...

Yes, money thrives on being counted. Rich countries get richer because they know how to count, while poor ones get poorer by disregarding this mercantile wisdom and keeping their head in clouds of unselfish principles.

It has to be added to the above that the Americans have now strengthened for a long time to come their control over Near East oil, while the Soviet Union, in addition to reducing military deliveries abroad—that accounted for approximately one-fourth of our currency receipts—has halved its oil exports, and provided more than half of its currency. It has to be thought that the funds now crossing the ocean from Western and Persian Gulf states to pay U.S. military bills have affected the movement of capital in the world, reducing our potential for obtaining extremely essential credits.

Finally, by way of a general conclusion, it is believed, with reason, that electronics, information science, a superior intelligence and communications service, and highly accurate weapons won the blitzkrieg at the end of the 20th century. U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney speaks of the "military-technical revolution." But no less important than highly accurate weapons are highly accurate forecasting, the choice of the most advantageous options, and the scrupulous evaluation of all possible consequences. In this sense far from the whole backstage history of the recent war has been revealed.

I cannot say with certainty whether the United States reckoned up in advance both at the level of the official leadership and at the general level of the political and economic establishment the profits and losses and the desired financial balance spoken of in these notes. Or whether Moscow reckoned them up. One thing is obvious—whoever does not reckon things up miscalculates. Leaving aside the political aspect of the matter, we have really come off worse in the financial aspect. With hindsight, this proves how important it was for us to gamble not on a military but on a peaceful settlement of the conflict, particularly under the conditions of our profound economic crisis.

China

Ivashko Meets Beijing Mayor Li Ximing

*PM0804090591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Moscow Meeting"]

[Text] V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met 4 April with Li Ximing, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Beijing CPC Municipal Committee, who is heading a Beijing CPC Municipal Committee delegation to the USSR at the invitation of Moscow CPSU City Committee.

V.A. Ivashko told his interlocutor about the situation in the Soviet Union. He noted that the CPSU's line of fundamentally renewing society, consolidating all its healthy forces, and retaining and strengthening the Union remains unchanged.

The dynamic development of Soviet-Chinese relations in all areas shows that these relations are on the right path and are in line with both sides' interests. Ivashko expressed the hope that, while in the USSR, the Chinese comrades would be able to fully experience Soviet people's feelings of friendship for the Chinese people.

Li Ximing shared his impressions about his stay in Moscow, his trip to Leningrad, and his meetings with the leaders of their party organizations. He expressed satisfaction with the development of Soviet-Chinese interparty ties and talked about the features of the current stage of the reform policy being implemented in China.

Li Ximing conveyed greetings to M.S. Gorbachev from Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, and Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council.

Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR, took part in the talks.

The Beijing CPC Municipal Committee, having completed its 10-day visit to the USSR, left for Beijing the same day.

Sino-Soviet Negotiations Round Begins

LD0504101591 Moscow TASS in English 1003 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—A new round of Sino-Soviet negotiations on mutual reduction of troops and the building up of confidence in the military sphere in the border area opened here today. The sides will continue the substantive discussion of the issues linked with the topic of the negotiations.

The Soviet delegation is led by G.V. Kireev, ambassador at large of the USSR Foreign Ministry; the Chinese delegation is led by Liu Guangzhi, deputy head of the Chinese Foreign Ministry's USSR and East European affairs department.

Northeast Asia

Rogachev Talks With Delegates at ESCAP Meeting

LD0504112191 Moscow TASS in English 1051 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] Tokyo April 5 TASS [place as received]—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev, leading the Soviet delegation at the 47th session of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), met representatives of several Asian-Pacific states.

Rogachev held talks with Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas, Minister of the Thai Prime Minister's Office Kasem Kasemsi and Vietnamese Deputy Foreign Minister Vu Khoan.

The talks focused on a Cambodian settlement. The sides stressed the need to cut short the pause in the negotiating process. For this purpose, it is necessary to call a meeting by the Cambodian Supreme National Council in the near future.

Rogachev also discussed prospects for a dialogue between the USSR and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) during his meetings with the Indonesian and Thai representatives.

Meets ROK Foreign Minister

SK0804065391 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Text] Soviet Vice Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev met with ROK Foreign Minister Yi Sang-ok in Seoul.

In the meeting, the two noted with satisfaction the fact that USSR-ROK summit talks last December have greatly contributed to developing the bilateral relations, and then stressed the fact that the scope of bilateral contacts have once again confirmed the justness of the decision to establish diplomatic relations between Moscow and Seoul.

Concerning this, station commentator Oleg Alekseyev writes the following: The Soviet decision to establish diplomatic relations with the ROK last September proves that it was a clear evidence of the new thinking that has recently been assumed as the unchanging basis of our country's external activity. One of the important principles of this new thinking is pragmatism.

Two sovereign states have continued to exist on the Korean Peninsula over the past 40 years. We have maintained relations of friendship with one of the two states, while ignoring the other. Can this be justified? In particular, can this be justified at a time when South Korea is playing an increasingly important international role in the Far East?

In this context, the Soviet Union proceeds from a concern about the military and political detente on the Korean Peninsula. So, the Soviet Union's maintaining of friendship relations with the two sovereign states on the Korean Peninsula can only contribute to the difficult process of probing mutual interests between these two states which last year have led to the level of government-to-government contacts.

In the talks between Soviet Vice Foreign Minister Rogachev and ROK Foreign Minister Yi Sang-ok, the participants paid much attention to the prevailing situation on the Korean Peninsula and discussing ways of normalizing these relations.

For example, Soviet Vice Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev, explaining the Soviet stand on the ROK's effort to become a UN member, stressed Moscow's point of view that both the North and South of Korea should be admitted into the United Nations simultaneously.

Next, he said: The South and North need to agree on this. Otherwise, there can arise a complicated situation which can have a negative impact on the process of normalizing the situation on the Korean Peninsula.

When it comes to the developing relations of friendship between the USSR and South Korea, it is undesirable to approach it purely on the basis of a political standpoint. To our country, the economic cooperation we are fostering with Seoul is no less important.

Today, the ROK is a country that has achieved a great deal in economic development. Fostering cooperation with the ROK is one of the important factors that will enable the Soviet Union to solve difficult economic problems.

UN Group Views Asian-Pacific Security Problems

LD0504190991 Moscow TASS in English 1757 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Klementyev]

[Text] Vladivostok April 5 TASS—The situation in the Korean peninsula, the lowering of military confrontation in the Asia-Pacific region were discussed by a meeting of the United Nations associations of the Soviet Union, the United States, China and Japan. The meeting of U.N. associations on problems of security in the Asia-Pacific region ended here today. Head of the U.S. delegation, former defence secretary and former assistant to the president for national security affairs Frank Carlucci said that such a meeting would have been unthinkable seven or eight years ago.

Carlucci said that although differences on a number of questions persisted, the similarity of views was being formed in such debates.

Heads and participants in all delegation interviewed by TASS said that fragments of ice of the cold war are melting albeit slowly.

Professor Masashi Nishihara from Social Sciences Department of Japan's Defence Agency believes that the situation in the Asia-Pacific region and in Europe can change for the better sooner, and that the potential of goodneighbourly political, economic and other contacts between Japan and the USSR are yet to be tapped. Peoples should discard outdated approaches to international politics before they usher in the 21st century.

Head of Chinese delegation Shi Xia, deputy director of Institute of Strategic Studies, expressed satisfaction over the fact that the attitudes of the Soviet and Chinese delegations coincide on most of the important problems and that new principles and forms of communication emerge in the Asia-Pacific region. This will be promoted also by a new high level meeting of Soviet and Chinese leaders.

Soviet delegates, specifically ambassador at large of the USSR Foreign Ministry Vladimir Fedotov, expressed the confidence that the meeting of representatives of the United Nations associations will promote the further improvement of the climate in international relations. There are plans to hold such meetings in Beijing and Tokyo.

The message of the Russian foreign minister to the meeting was read out. "Our purposes and goals are peaceful. We have no claims of military, territorial or ideological nature," the statement says. "In this context sovereign Russia intends to exert efforts independently or in the framework of the renewed union to help turn the Asia-Pacific region into a zone of stability, dialogue and all- round cooperation. We favour excluding the region from the sphere of military rivalry. We are for building up confidence, for political settlement of all disputed questions, broad and unhampered development of ties in the areas of trade, environmental protection, culture and human contacts," the document says.

Commentary Views Military Tension With Japan

OW0804115891 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Kalin commentary]

[Text] According to a report by KYODO, the Defense Agency of Japan appears to expect that President Gorbachev's upcoming visit will result in a drastic reduction in Soviet troops in the Far East. In this connection, Moscow Radio military commentator Kalin writes as follows:

As evident in the report, the Defense Agency appears to see the drastic reduction in Soviet troops in the Far East as one of the conditions necessary to improve Japanese-Soviet relations and ensure the security of the Asian and Pacific region. The Japanese military believes that the Soviet troops in the Far East maintain greater military strength than their defense requirements. For example, Mr. Sadakuyama of the Defense Agency recently said that the Soviet military threat has hampered improvement Japanese-Soviet relations and the insurance of security in the Asian and Pacific region. I cannot but question this. As listeners know, the words of the Soviet threat were deleted from the 1990 Japanese Defense White Paper. Former [as heard] Defense Agency Director General Ikeda, in his inaugural address, confirmed that there was no military threat by the Soviet Union to Japan. To my surprise, however, voices diametrically opposed to this are heard in the Defense Agency. Notwithstanding, I do not want to rebut the argument for the Soviet threat to Japan. That is because the question itself of whether the Soviet Union poses a military threat to Japan is groundless, not because there are no Soviet arguments against it.

NEWSWEEK, an American weekly, in its 1 April edition, carried the results of a poll, which are of great interest to me. According to the results, three-quarters of the Americans polled saw Japanese military power as more threatening to the United States than Soviet military power. How is the Soviet Union, which shares its border with Japan and maintains no alliance, to deal with this question? Hence, it has become necessary to debate the question of strong Japanese military power. I think it would be far better to leave out this question than to strive to find ways to resolve it. I believe it is rather urgent for Japan and the Soviet Union to take measures to build each other's confidence in the military area. In this regard, the Soviet side made appropriate proposals to the Japanese last autumn. In the proposals, the Soviet Union asked that top leaders of the two countries announce that they do not see each other as a hostile nation. However, Japan has thus far made no concrete response to the proposals. As seen in the KYODO report, Japan appears to have no intention of establishing any military ties with the Soviet Union. For example, Mr. Fujishima of the Defense Agency took the view that the question of establishing military ties between the two countries should be linked to the solution of the territorial issue, the conclusion of a peace treaty, and the solution of other issues pending between two countries. I do not believe that this linkage is the best idea. I believe that, since the two countries are unable to resolve all the issues pending between them, it is necessary for them to make a phased move toward the establishment of military ties. I believe the strengthened confidence between Japan and the Soviet Union in the military area will stimulate disarmament.

President Gorbachev will certainly make new proposals on relaxing military tension between the two countries when he visits Japan. I believe the military tension cannot be relaxed by unilateral efforts. Joint efforts, with mutual interests in mind, can rather carry out the important task of relaxing tension.

This has been a commentary on relaxing military tension between Japan and the Soviet Union.

Kuril Islands Problems, Solutions Eyed

PM0504131591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5

["Kuril Reportage" by correspondent N. Bratchikov: "On Our Remotest Islands"]

[Excerpts] Kuril Islands, April—I have been flying to the Kurils for 15 years on journalistic business, and I never cease to be amazed at their primitive beauty and wealth. On the approach flight to the large southern "pearl" of Kunashir, on a sunny day, you can see the fiery double crater of the volcano Tyatya looming in the sky. Nearby, its brother volcano, Mendeleyev, stretches out its snowy mantle. Azure bays where beneath the waves lurk shoals of fish and plantations of valuable water plants, inexhaustible stocks of sea cucumber, crab, and prawns. When you go down from the airfield, which is on the shoulder of the volcano, to the rayon center of Yuzhno-Kurilsk, the island's only highway winds its way through the debris of pine and mixed forests interwoven with liana and overgrown with bamboo. Crystal-clear streams and rivers full of fine fish. Hot, healing springs gush from beneath the boulders, and underground thermal waters release their steam. [passage omitted]

"The southern Kurils must be handed over to Japan. These islands with their bare cliffs are not worth the cost to interstate relations between the two countries..." That remark was made by A.I. Gruzdev—a man who you would think was not indifferent to the islands' fate. I talked with him before my trip to the Kurils, whose length and breadth he has trodden, as he himself put it. He led the southern Kurils hydrographic expedition, carried out excavations, and knows the true value of the people's property. You certainly cannot accuse him of politicking—an accusation that was leveled at USSR People's Deputy Yu. Afanasyev, rector of the Historical Archives Institute, who stated when visiting Japan in October 1989 that "an end must be put to postwar injustices," thereby eliminating the main obstacle to the establishment of broad ties between the USSR and the Land of the Rising Sun. Nor can you compare his view to the opinion of the famous chess player [Kasparov] who cheerfully turned the Kurils into pawns in the game. I wonder what comment they would have made on the indignant message to PRAVDA, running to seven pages, written on behalf of 14,000 people of the Kurils by Mikhail Ivanovich Tereshko, chairman of Yuzhno-Kurilskiy Rayispolkom [rayon soviet executive committee]; this message totally demolishes the stance of those who would very much like to exchange their homeland for stereo tape recorders and "videos" or for the billions promised to buy the islands.

"We, the inhabitants of the southern Kurils are categorically opposed to our islands' being handed over to Japan, with the resettlement of Soviet citizens or the imposition of Japanese-Soviet administration of the islands. We would like the government, the USSR people's deputies, and everyone who is trying to redraw territorial borders at a stroke to understand the main thing: These days, people's fates are not decided without their participation."

I flew to the Kurils in a Yak-40 plane packed full of passengers. A storm was approaching. And instead of the three planned trips, only one could be made. Sitting next to me was L. Ilyasova, an old fisherwoman from Krabozavodsk, which is on Shikotan. Larisa Akhmedovna had been traveling on the mainland for three months. She went to visit her submariner son in Sevastopol, and then to Tashkent, Rostov, Sverdlovsk, and Pervouralsk. She originally came to the Pacific from Tataria as a recruit. She thought she had come temporarily, to earn a bit extra. But she put down "anchor" here forever. We talked about the islands' fate...

"Believe me, there is no better place than the Kurils in all the wide world. I raised my children here and taught them. Erik graduated from the naval school in Vladivostok, and Gulnara became a medical attendant in Malokurilsk. The fish combine gave me everything. And as for my kids, they only know one home—Shikotan. Every year they fly back to the nest. How can I leave the island? I'll never go."

In the course of the conversation she introduced me to the people of Shikotan: There is Captain Vasiliy Soldatov, who has been a fisherman for 30 years. Volodya Nosov is sitting in front. His mother died. She looked after the helicopter pad at Krabozavodsk. The soldier is on his way to the funeral. He is all in black, for mourning. In all, there are eight people from Krabozavodsk on the plane.

And there I was in Yuzhno-Kurilsk, which was in the grip of a snowstorm; I sat in the office of the very same administrator who wrote the letter to the newspaper on behalf of his fellow countrymen—M. Tereshko, chairman of Yuzhno-Kurilskiy Soviet of People's Deputies. The Kurilsk "governor" has just said goodbye to a Japanese television crew who have been preparing a direct relay to Tokyo for two weeks now. The Japanese turned everything upside down. And now journalists have also flown in from France, Britain, Italy. Where to house them, what to feed them—it's enough to make your head spin.

The event that has roused all the islands is the forthcoming visit to Japan by USSR President M. Gorbachev.

A referendum on the fate of the Kurils was held in this context. Mikhail Ivanovich looks over the questionnaires: "Do you think it possible for the islands of Kunashir, Iturup, and the Lesser Kuril chain (Shikotan, Tanfilyeva, Zelenyy, Polonskiy, Yuriy, Anuchina) to be handed over to Japan?" In Yuzhno-Kurilskiy Rayon, 11,704 people took part in the vote. Some 68.8 percent answered in the negative, and 2,520 people said "yes." Precisely the same referendum was held on Iturup, in Uglegorskiy Rayon, where the percentage saying "no" was much higher.

Mikhail Ivanovich nervously waves his pen around the desk, trying to explain to the correspondent why the expected unanimity was not found. A poll was also held in Moscow in August, on behalf of the Japanese weekly AERA—there, 22 percent of those polled would have liked to exchange the islands for economic aid. The politicians dinned it into them, you know: What do we want your bare cliffs for? The islanders, unlike the capital's inhabitants, know the value of the Kurils, but just imagine, they too would like to get hold of something substantial from the Japanese—personal villas built somewhere in the south of Sakhalin in exchange for the territory. What kind of people are these? Mainly newcomers, temporary people who came here to make money, and to hell with everything else.

"You should feel the people's mood at rallies and meetings of labor collectives," the chairman says, putting a cheerful face on it. "Our Sakhalin USSR Deputy V. Guliy barely mentioned the possibility, without having consulted with the people, of the imposition of dual administration on the islands, and look what happened— the voters demanded that he immediately come and explain himself: How dare he?"

We had not been following the Japanese Government's example and indulging in propaganda and agitation for the Kurils. There had been no need. Everyone was adamant—the Kurils are ours, period. Confusion, however, has been sown in people's minds of late: Here we are, making loud noises, attending rallies, holding referendums, and collecting signatures for a petition, but we do not know the top people's views.

Tereshko reached for a file and took out of it a sheaf of resolutions from rallies, instructions to people's deputies, and requests to the USSR Government and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet. The latest document was from a meeting of local soviet deputies, addressed to USSR and RSFSR deputies.

What lies behind such a categorical petition? I spent five days traveling around the South Kurils, trying to understand the islanders' confusion. I went by helicopter to Shikotan. I went on sea patrol in a warship with border guards. I looked around the new fish-processing plant, constructed to replace the old wooden one that had burned down. School. Store. Post office. Plant office. Workers' dining room. I even went by night to the sanatorium hot beach area, where children had been taken by border guard ship from Shikotan during the school vacation for treatment at the medicinal springs. [passage omitted]

I made the acquaintance of innumerable people. I will single out schoolteacher Fedor Ivanovich Pyzhyanov. My first meeting with him occurred last August, when the Kurils were rocked by events more alarming than a volcanic eruption—Russian legislature head B.N. Yeltsin flew in. And how: Apart from the fish industry minister and some famous Russian explorers, none of the senior leaders had ever visited the neglected islands. So the islanders were all intent on dinning into their "excellencies" their importance to Russia and their endless troubles. So that they know, not just from information provided by the island bosses genuflecting in offices in the capital—"we earnestly request"—and not just from maps, that there is a string of little, off-the-beaten-track islands somewhere in the Pacific Ocean. [passage omitted]

I read the rich prose of F. Pyzhyanov's academic work "Beyond the Horizon to Unknown Lands," published to mark the 250th anniversary of the first voyage by Russian ships to the shores of the South Kurils and Japan. In his authentic account of the long history, the author objectively examines such sensitive themes as the Russians' relations with the indigenous population and Russian-Japanese relations in the Pacific Ocean region.

Probably no one has studied so deeply and with such feeling the postwar period in which the Kuril Japanese were deported from the islands, having lived there for many decades. It was a real human tragedy.

"Now it could happen again. Only to Russian people this time. In 1948-1949, 6,330 Japanese were forcibly evacuated from the South Kurils. A little over one-half of the exiles are still alive—in the main they are very old, but still active people, who want, in their declining years, to go there and at least take a peep at their own villages (there were 87 Japanese settlements in the south), and pay homage to their ancestors. Some of them I know personally and I am even better acquainted with their forefathers—indeed, the 'Fregat' society has identified around 1,500 Japanese graves."

How is a repetition of the tragedy to be avoided? How are relations between the age-old neighbors to be arranged? Where is the golden mean in the policy regarding the disputed territories? How is the dispute to be resolved? Fedor Ivanovich casts a critical eye over the three approaches to the solution of the "northern territories" issue that are widely discussed in the press—preservation of the status quo, transfer of the lesser chain to Japan, joint ownership of the disputed islands, and the establishment of a Soviet-Japanese administration there. A fourth option, proposed by V. Fedorov, chairman of the Sakhalin Oblast Soviet Executive Committee—taking the aforementioined islands, belonging to the USSR, and also part (on agreement between the sides) of the adjacent Japanese territory and declaring all of it a "free economic zone," which must be jointly developed—seems to Fedorov to be fantastic and unrealistic. Why, perhaps there will be a fifth and a sixth option—that is a matter for future generations of politicians. One thing is clear: It is fatal, indeed impossible for two great powers to continue to have an iron curtain between them. Open borders, where there is nothing secret to conceal. Public diplomacy—this is the quickest way to find the solution we are looking for. And a search for forms of joint management. An ocean zone, no matter how infinitely rich its biological resources may be, must be preserved and must constantly replenish its stocks artificially. We can only do this together. [passage omitted]

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Yanayev Receives SRV Assembly Delegation

PM0804103791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Opinions"]

[Text] On 3 April USSR Vice President G.I. Yanayev met with an SRV National Assembly delegation headed by Le Quang Dao, chairman of the SRV National Assembly and deputy chairman of the SRV State Council.

There was a detailed, frank exchange of opinions on the situation in the Soviet Union and Vietnam and on the state of and prospects for the development of Soviet-Vietnamese relations.

The interlocutors unanimously noted that the developing comprehensive cooperation between the USSR and the SRV serves the interests of both countries' peoples and is of great importance both for them and for other Southeast Asian countries and the whole of the Asia-Pacific region.

The conversation took place in a warm, comradely atmosphere. SRV Ambassador to the USSR Nguyen Manh Cam also participated.

CPSU Group Returns From Lao Party Congress

PM0504143791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general headline: "Official Reports"]

[Text] The CPSU delegation headed by M.M. Burokevicius, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, which had been taking part in the Fifth Lao People's Revolutionary Party Congress, returned to Moscow from Vientiane 4 April.

Prospects of Cambodian Peace Talks Assessed

BK0504161191 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 4 Apr 91

[Viktor Valentinov commentary]

[Text] In western Cambodia, near the Thai border, fighting has erupted again. Only recently the Khmer Rouge launched an offensive against government forces' positions. According to statements by Khmer Rouge ringleaders, this is the final offensive before the victory. Now government forces have successfully attacked Khmer Rouge positions and those of other opposing forces. What is this? Is this an unstable military situation or something more important? We put this question to our observer, Comrade Viktor Valentinov. Here is his assessment.

In the East, as in the West, people like to play the tug of war game. If the two sides were of equal strength, no one would win for a long time until one side is down on the ground and is pulled along by the winner. I have no doubt that you like to play this game. This contest, however, sometimes ends with a different result. This is when both sides are worn out and on the ground. The contest has already ended. Who do I talk to about this game?

The military situation in Cambodia makes me recall that this kind of game should be stopped. It is clear that there will be no solution through military means. However, the contestants still try to pull the rope. It is partly true that this situation has its own characteristics. The opposing forces, which have been nurtured by foreign assistance, are sufficently strong to carry out an offensive against the Phnom Penh troops; however, they are not strong enough to win on the battlefield, which is what they want. On the contrary, Phnom Penh has sufficient strength because the Phnom Penh government has manpower and material throughout most of the country. But Phnom Penh has made efforts to solve the conflict through political means and has no desire to sacrifice the lives of hundreds of soldiers.

In spite of this, the other side still pulls the rope. Whether it wants to or not, Phnom Penh has been forced to pull it as well. It has been known for a long time that if there is no military solution, the conflict should be solved politically. This path has been determined by the document of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council [UNSC]—the Soviet Union, the United States, China, France, and Britain—which, despite their differing attitudes and goals, have managed to find common ground, that is the desire to see Cambodia with peace, security, and freedom. True, no one overestimates the contribution of these five.

It is the Cambodian people themselves who have to solve their problem. No one opposes this right of the Cambodian people. The Cambodian parties themselves should discuss all the documents proposed by the five major powers by clearly determining some points in these documents and by moving forward through mutual concessions. The negotiations have already started and made progress. Lately, however, the talks have slowed down and then were at a standstill. Why? Is this because the Cambodian sides cannot overcome their differences?

It is clear that Phnom Penh and the opposing side have openly stated the necessity to settle the issue politically and comprehensively through negotiations. What else then is needed? In my view, it is not possible to answer just one aspect of this question. However, in my view, the composition of the opposing Cambodian side should be examined. Members of the coalition government were competing against one another right from the first day. This has resulted in a hesitant and indecisive attitude by the opposition. Samdech Sihanouk does not trust and is afraid of the Pol Pot group, which has implemented a genocidal policy. Son Sann, who once made a mistake, now no longer trusts Samdech Sihanouk. As for the Pol Pot group, it is afraid of Samdech Sihanouk. To put it bluntly, the Pol Pot group is not afraid of Norodom Sihanouk himself as a person but of Norodom Sihanouk's international prestige as a political personality recognized by everyone. For this reason, Samdech Sihanouk has to agree to negotiate; otherwise, the so-called alliance, that is the Khmer Rouge, will send fresh troops to fight. The tug of war continues.

Near East & South Asia

PRAVDA Comments on UN's Resolution on Iraq

PM0804093791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

["Observer's Opinion" by Yuriy Glukhov]

[Text] So, the UN Security Council has adopted a resolution designed to ensure a final settlement of the Iraq-Kuwait conflict. Its content is specific. It frames the resolution of key problems of this most complex crisis in practical terms.

In particular, unregulated border issues have been a constant source of friction between Iraq and Kuwait. This was one of the causes of the war. That is why the demarcation of the border and the deployment of UN observers in the demilitarized zone between the two countries will help to remove tension and avoid new hostile acts.

Iraq's militarist course is a powerful factor in destabilizing the situation in the region. Baghdad has twice become involved in bloody and destructive wars in the past 10 years. One with Iran, the other with Kuwait. And the accumulation of an arsenal of the most dangerous armaments has been accompanied by the threat that arms such as chemical, bacteriological, or nuclear weapons might be used. There have also been instances of Baghdad's recourse to toxic substances. It is quite logical that the resolution demanded that Iraq reaffirm its obligations under the relevant international agreements, and also that it destroy existing weapons stockpiles. New shipments of weapons are prohibited.

It is natural that the aggressor should also bear material liability for the damage done. If we take account of Iraq's previous debts to its Arab donors, the compensation could run to more than 100 billion dollars. It is envisaged that some of Iraq's oil earnings will go to meet these payments.

We cannot fail to note the severity and radical nature of the measures elaborated by the UN Security Council, and with the complete unanimity of its permanent members, moreover. The only allowance made was the lifting of the embargo on food shipments to Iraq. The punishing of the aggressor should clearly be an object lesson to all those who embark on the slippery and dangerous path of military adventures. But will this precedent become the rule or will it go down as an exception?

Many other questions connected with settling the crisis in the Gulf region remain. How long will the U.S. troops, which form the backbone of the multinational forces, stay there? Is or is not the possibility ruled out that they may be subsequently employed in the event, for instance, of a delay in Baghdad's fulfillment of the new resolution? Has the internal political situation in Iraq and the state of civil war—that is, the real opportunity for the regime to take part in the practical steps worked out and scheduled by the UN Security Council—been taken into account? Will the demilitarization of Iraq be accompanied by the ending of the arms race in the Gulf and the Near East and by a quest for a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict? These are not idle questions. Genuine peace and security for the peoples of the region and their future will depend on the answers.

TASS Urges UN Measures on Iraq 'Genocide'

LD0504145491 Moscow TASS in English 1433 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS international analyst Yuriy Tyssovsky]

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—"Security and stability have been restored in northern Iraq and gangs of looters and mercenaries have been routed there. The Kurdic population is glad to be saved from them and is ready to drive out the rebels," Vice-Chairman of the Iraqi Revolutionary Command Council Izzat Ibrahim has told this body, the Iraq News Agency (INA) reports.

Events can be interpreted in different ways, of course. But there is a limit to everything. Baghdad has obviously overstepped this limit long ago. The Iraqi leadership continued to deny the obvious truth, for instance, when thousands of Iraqi servicemen were shown on television surrendering to the multinational force. Endless columns of Iraqi POW's were seen by scores of millions of TV-viewers, but the regime clung to its false version. At the time when the anti-Iraq coalition occupied a fifth of

Iraq's territory and liberated Kuwait, Baghdad insisted that allied servicemen were being crushed like flies by the "victorious" Iraqi army.

The Iraqi regime has not learned its lesson. It continues to lie and distort facts. Now it is trying to misinform the public in connection with the genocide it has unleashed against Kurds in the north and Shiites in the south of the country. It ought to be noted that the Iraqi Army has proved to be more prepared to deal with its own people than to fight the multinational force. As a result, thousands of people are now seeking asylum in Iran and about a million are eager to cross the Turkish border. The popular uprising against Husayn's regime is being suppressed ruthlessly. The U.S. command explains its non-interference by the fact that it has no mandate to act otherwise. The U.S. Administration does not want its troops to be sucked into a civil war in Iraq. In the meantime, blood continues to be spilt.

All hopes are now linked with the United Nations. A meeting of the U.N. Security Council was called today on France's initiative. It will discuss the yet unofficial draft resolutions tabled by Paris and Ankara. They express profound concern about Iraqi repressions against the peaceful population, demand from Baghdad an immediate end to cruelties, compelling people to flee the country.

Of course, the problem is very delicate, because many people are prone to regard it as a purely domestic affair. Nevertheless, terror against civilians in many other countries has been discussed by the international community on more than one occasion. Secondly, the Iraqi regime's inhuman actions have destabilised the situation on the borders with neighbouring states and this is by no means Iraq's internal affair.

The United Nations must take the most vigorous measures to stop the Iraqi regime, which is desperately clinging to power, from continuing ruthless repressions against its own citizens. The world community wants to believe that Baghdad is not interested in aggravating the situation, which is most complicated as it is, by new universally condemned actions.

Commentary Views UN Resolution on Gulf War

LD0404171991 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 4 Apr 91

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Excerpts] The United Nations Security Council has passed a resolution on basic principles of a settlement of the Iraqi-Kuwaiti conflict. Yuriy Soltan elaborates:

It is an important resolution drawing the line under the Gulf War. First steps are being planned to ensure stability in the region. Iraq is proposed to agree to severe conditions—in some aspects too severe, to my mind. But the aggressor cannot be left unpunished. [passage omitted]

The resolution, in my opinion, cannot be devoid of certain shortcomings—it does not take into account the enormous damage done to the Iraqi economy by missile attacks and bombings. It envisages no immediate lifting of the sanctions imposed on Iraq.

True, Iraqi compliance with the resolution will make it possible to begin providing Iraq with large scale humanitarian aid in the form of the delivery of foodstuffs, medicines and medical equipment and of also essential goods to meet demands of civilian population.

What's more, the resolution sets no date for the withdrawal of the anti-Iraqi coalition's troops which occupy today up to 20 percent of Iraqi territory.

George Bush has declared that the American troops have no intention to stay for long there, but in the opinion of, (?say), Yemen's envoy to the United Nations, it will take probably years to complete this withdrawal. I may also add that the Chinese envoy, too, expressed regret that the resolution sets no time limit for the troops' withdrawal.

Nevertheless, the resolution lays a fair foundation for the settlement of the Iraqi-Kuwaiti conflict. It is of principled importance that the Soviet United Nations Ambassador Yuliy Vorontsov said that the responsibility for the ensurance of the inviolability of the border between Iraq and Kuwait is laid on the United Nations Security Council which is authorized to employ other necessary measures for the purpose. The Council is also expected to play a key role in exercising a permanent control over the resolution's implementation. Twelve member countries voted for, including its five permanent members—Britain, China ,the Soviet Union, the United States, and France. Yemen and Equador abstained from voting, Cuba voted against the resolution.

The unity displayed in the course of the struggle against the aggression and now preserved in the approaches to the postwar settlement gives us reason to hope that the lasting peace in the region will be restored.

Kurdish, Iraqi Citizens' Suffering Detailed

LD0604215391 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1600 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] Active consultations took place yesterday at the UN Security Council on the situation of the Kurds in Iraq. The draft resolutions presented by France and Turkey were discussed. Both denounce the harsh measures being taken by the Iraqi authorities against the Kurds, measures that are forcing the people to leave their places of residence and seek shelter in other countries. They urge the international community to provide humanitarian aid to the victims of persecution. Aleksey Zlatorunskiy says that all the media have been reporting for several days on the tragic situation facing the Kurdish people. The Kurds, who staged an uprising, clashed faced to face with the Iraqi regular army, which is well equipped despite its defeat in the Desert Storm war. The result of this clash is known: tens of thousands of

Kurdish revolutionaries have been killed or injured. Kurdish cities and villages have been destroyed, and millions of refugees have left for neighboring countries. A Kurdish officer asked reporters in Iraq: What could we have done with machine-guns against helicopters and tanks? It was difficult to confront them.

Today, hundreds of the thousands of women, old people, and children are on the move, dying from cold, hunger, and disease. Naturally, there is no justification for the harsh oppression being carried out by the Iraqi forces against the participants in the Shiite uprising in southern Iraq and the Kurdish uprising in the north. At a news conference in Moscow yesterday, Sergey Lavrov expressed his anxiety at the events in Iraq UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar also expressed his strong concern. Many heads of state, prime ministers, and social and political figures condemned the persecution of the Kurds. The issue now, however, is not confined to political assessments of the situation in Iraq. The Iraqi people and the Kurds also need urgent help. One can welcome the wide campaign all over the world to provide humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people. Doctors, foodstuffs, and medicines are being sent to the war-stricken areas. The International Red Cross has provided this aid directly. It is expected that this aid will increase greatly and will assume a regular nature after the UN Security Council adopts resolutions on this matter. It is expected that this aid will ease, albeit only to a certain extent, the suffering of the Iraqis, and the Kurds in particular. In this new situation one must definitely ask: Why should people pay the price of the political adventures of their leaders? The Iraqi situation is a reminder that political adventures bring tragedies and sufferings to the people. The proof is Iraq's aggression against Kuwait with its tragic consequences for the Iraqi people.

Arab Journalist on Solution To Mideast Issues

LD0704212991 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1400 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Commentary by Arab journalist (Ahmad Abu Rashid) from "The Soviet Union Through the Eyes of an Arab" feature]

[Excerpts] Since the moment the conflict in the Gulf ceased to be Iraqi-Kuwaiti, with the arrival of the invading U.S. forces from the first days of the crisis on Saudi territory and in the Gulf region, and with the Zionist rulers of Israel beginning openly and with an unparalleled enthusiasm inciting aggression against Iraq, since that moment the place of the Palestinian people and its leadership had to be in the trench opposing the U.S.-Israeli alliance. But, the U.S.-Atlantic-Israeli information and propaganda media, whose dangerous role appeared in the Gulf crisis in an unprecedented manner, tried to portray the Palestinian position as being at variance with international legality. The aim was to harm the legitimacy of its cause, which is based on the resolutions of the Security Council and the UN General Assembly, and to liquidate the important political gains realized by the Palestinian cause under the leadership of the PLO. [passage omitted]

I believe that the Gulf war, which closed with the end of the fight to recover Kuwait, will have inaugurated, in the full meaning of the word, the beginning of an historic turning point which will be witnessing a ceaseless series of battles and crises. These battles and crises will have repercussions throughout the region and the world. This is why it will not be surprising to see the Middle East witness the biggest crisis in its history. There will be meetings, visits, plans, maps, statements, promises, ministers coming and investors leaving, and continuous movement aimed only at seeking self-interests. Thus, Bush announced at a news conference at the beginning of March that he would be moving quickly to resolve the three problems: the Palestinian, the Lebanese, and the Iraqi problems.

In my view, the thesis calling for dealing with international legality with a single standard, especially after the Cold War, and the flexible linkage between the Gulf crisis and the Palestinian issue, has been largely echoed. [passage omitted]

Despite its negative aspects, the Gulf crisis will have given a fresh momentum to the trends calling for dealing with the Palestinian question and the consequences of the 1967 aggression as being the main hotbed of tension in the region, and because it cannot take procrastination any more. In this respect, and despite Israeli sources, David Levi said before the outbreak of the war in the Gulf that Israel was expecting very difficult and hard days after the Gulf war. He added: We will be subjected to international pressure to force us to withdraw from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Proceeding from this, the various concerned sides began to prepare scenarios of this settlement, each for its own platforms, especially the rulers of Israel, who are as much worried by the international trend to resolve the Palestinian question as they hope to realize a settlement that suits them, with the support of the United States, which, according to Israeli sources also, is described by David Levi as follows: Today, there is only one superpower in the world: the United States. [passage omitted]

The rulers of Israel hope that the results of the Gulf war will be as they imagine, to serve their plans and aspirations to liquidate the Palestinian question definitively in the framework of what David Levi calls a new order in the Middle East, emanating naturally from the international order, and in accordance with U.S. criteria.

In his well-known speech on the Palestinian question, President Bush spoke about the Palestinian question and the need to resolve it on the basis of UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and on the basis of land for peace at a time when he denied the PLO its qualification for legitimacy and the fact that it is the sole representative of the Palestinian people. He also declared that the

United States stuck to its decision to stop dialogue with the organization and launched a vicious campaign against the PLO.

I believe that this campaign against the PLO and the attempts led by the U.S. Administration to question its ability to represent the Palestinian people, in fact, began long before the events in the Gulf and greatly increased after the entry of Iraqi troops in Kuwait directly. But, the attempts retreated before the firm stand taken by the Palestinian people inside and outside and its leadership in confronting the U.S.-Atlantic invasion of the region, its damaging threats to the future of the Arab region and the Palestinian question, and the sticking to international legality and its implementation without selection on all the issues of the region. [passage omitted]

I believe that all attempts, policies, and conspiracies seeking to eliminate the Palestinian question and to transcend and overlook the PLO in any solution to the Arab-Zionist conflict will not succeed because the PLO is one of the achievements of the Palestinian people, and it is its sole and legitimate representative. Without the PLO, it is not possible to speak about any settlement in the region, and if the question of the Palestinian people is not resolved in a radical and just way, the region will remain a hotbed of tension and explosion that threatens security and stability in the region and all over the world.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Yazov Meets With Officers Released by EPLF

PM0704151191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by "Our Correspondent": "For Courage and Loyalty to Duty"]

[Text] As announced in the press, Lieutenant Colonels Yu. Kalistratov and Ye. Churayev and Senior Lieutenant A. Kuvaldin returned home on 29 March after spending more than three years in captivity. They were sent to Ethiopia in the past under a Soviet-Ethiopian intergovernmental agreement to assist in training Ethiopian Army servicemen. The Soviet military specialists were captured by separatists 17 March 1988 in the course of combat operations in the north of the country between government troops and Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPLF] detachments. Since then the USSR Foreign Ministry, the USSR Defense Ministry, and other Soviet bodies have not ceased for a single day their efforts to free the servicemen. These efforts have finally met with success. The Soviet officers, who worthily withstood all their ordeals and did nothing to sully their honor, have returned to their native land.

Yu. Kalistratov, Ye. Churayev, and A. Kuvaldin, along with their relatives, who were invited to Moscow, were received 1 April by USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov. He warmly congratulated the officers on their return home and the members of their families and relatives on the long-awaited meeting.

Orders from the USSR defense minster were also read out conferring on Yu. Kalistratov and Ye. Churayev the rank of colonel and on A. Kuvaldin the rank of major and awarding them the medal "For Valor in Military Service" First Class. The officers and their relatives were given mementos.

The defense minister gave orders for a vacation to be organized for the officers and for them to be paid compensation for these years, along with orders as regards questions of their future service.

Continuing Role Seen for African Commission

PM0504154191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent M. Pavlov: "African Countries To Take the Initiative"]

[Text] Luanda—An important role in resolving the complex problems connected with giving Namibia independence was played by the joint commission for a settlement in southwestern Africa, of which Angola, Cuba, Namibia, and the RSA [Republic of South Africa] are members and the USSR and the United States are observers.

The complete withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola which, according to the New York agreements, must be implemented by 1 July this year will complete the relevant stage in its work. The end of this process, however, does not signify the end of the commission's functions, because the accords reached will regulate relations among the signatory countries in the future, and situations covered by the present mandate could arise.

Consequently, at the 10th session of the commission held recently in Capetown, the RSA raised the question of its future. According to the newspaper JORNAL DE ANGOLA, all the participants noted the efficiency and ability with which this mechanism—unique in its composition and functions—resolves difficult problems. The commission's members and observers are unanimous that this mechanism, which has recommended itself well, must be preserved. But they are not in agreement on its name and tasks or on the direction its actions should take.

According to JORNAL DE ANGOLA, Pretoria is in favor of transforming the commission into an economic group, of which the RSA, Angola, and Namibia will form the pivot. Pretoria is thereby trying to preserve existing ties with the African states or build new ones, which is something the RSA acutely needs. The newspaper goes on to remark that "running on ahead, we can say that the United States and the Soviet Union intend to change their observer status and become full members of the group. The country that will probably not find a place in this group is Cuba."

According to Herman Cohen, U.S. assistant secretary of state for African affairs, the commission should be transformed into a body responsible for regional security issues. The U.S. diplomat believes that the commission should retain its foreign policy aspect to prevent any undesirable development of events in the southern African region. He is also in favor of broadening this body to include other countries on the continent and a number of European states which have an active presence in Africa. Observers believe that France, Portugal, and Britain are the main countries in mind. In Cohen's opinion, the initiative on structural matters concerning the commission must come from its present African partners: the RSA, Angola, and Namibia.

The latter two countries also support the general idea of preserving the commission, although statements by their representatives have revealed no clear stand on its future so far.

East Europe

Paper Interviews Romania's Iliescu Before Visit

PM0504152991 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 5 Apr 91 p 3

[Interview with Romanian President Ion Iliescu conducted by IAN correspondent Vyacheslav Samoshkin: "I. Iliescu: New Ways of Cooperation Need To Be Sought"]

[Text] Romanian President Ion Iliescu arrived in the USSR yesterday on a working visit. Just before the president left for Moscow IAN correspondent Vyacheslav Samoshkin met him and recorded the following interview for RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA.

[Samoshkin] Mr. President, how do you regard the current state of Soviet-Romanian relations?

[Iliescu] We consider that our relations are normal and have every prerequisite for further development in all areas. Of course, these relations are experiencing the unfavorable effect of the situation in which the Soviet Union and we—like, incidentally, all East European countries—find ourselves. If we are talking, for example, about economic cooperation, this has suffered very much of late from interruptions in the work of the production apparatus and difficulties bound up with meeting contracts on time—on both our own and the Soviet side. That is to say, we are encountering roughly the same problems, but of course in different proportions. All these difficulties are primarily bound-up with the restructuring of our economies. But on another level, from the standpoint of political relations, there exists, I would say, good mutual understanding, which forms the basis for further good development of our ties.

[Moroshkin] What do you expect in that regard from your upcoming visit to Moscow?

[Iliescu] We attach special political significance to this visit—this is, after all, the first visit to the Soviet Union by the head of state since our revolution in December 1989.

The signing of the new Treaty on Cooperation, Good-Neighborliness, and Friendship, which we regard as a political event of special importance, will be the main feature on my itinerary. The visit will provide a good occasion for contacts with other representatives of the political leadership and with economists.

[Samoshkin] You sometimes hear the opinion voiced in Romania that the new treaty could be detrimental to direct ties between the Republic of Moldova and Romania. What do you think on that score?

[Iliescu] I would say quite the reverse: The treaty creates a favorable new framework in this sense because, in addition to provisions regarding relations with the central organs, the document also provides—in light of the changes which have taken place and which are taking place in the life of the Soviet Union—the opportunity for direct contacts to be set up with union republics, other territorial formations, and economic enterprises.

[Samoshkin] What plans does Romania have to develop cooperation in the Balkans?

[Iliescu] We view this cooperation among the Balkan states, which have represented a source of tension throughout history, in the new context of the development of relations on the continent of Europe. I think that development in bilateral and multilateral ties among these countries could make a positive contribution to the overall process of rapprochement among European countries. Here in the Balkans there are neighboring countries which belonged to the Warsaw Pact and those which are members of NATO, countries which are part of the Common Market and those which are members of CEMA, and countries with a market economy and those which are just starting moving toward it. We all have to find new ways to give specific form to our cooperation—at the political level as well as the economic, scientific, and cultural level—in light of our common history and common traditions.

[Samoshkin] And one final question: What is your personal relationship with M.S. Gorbachev like?

[Iliescu] My personal relationship with M.S. Gorbachev is very limited. Despite all the myths related on that score over many years about our long acquaintance, we only met each other last summer in Moscow. A combination of circumstances has served to feed such rumors: We are almost the same age and studied in Moscow at the same time—I at the power engineering institute, Gorbachev at the university. We were previously unacquainted, but I had always held in particular esteem and rated highly the role which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev played in the process of the transformations under way in the Soviet Union.

Romanian President's 4-6 April Visit Reported

Met By Yanayev on Arrival

LD0404181891 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 4 Apr 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Lyudmila Shvedova and Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—Ion Iliescu arrived in Moscow tonight on his first working visit here as Romanian president. He was invited by his Soviet opposite number Mikhail Gorbachev.

Iliescu was welcomed at Vnukovo-2 airport by Soviet Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev and other officials.

Talks with Gorbachev and the summit signing of a bilateral treaty on cooperation, goodneighbourly relations and friendship are expected to be the centrepiece of the three-day visit.

The treaty is a fundamental document reflecting changes under way in both countries as well as in all East European nations. It is based on the principles of international law, as sealed in the Paris Charter.

Iliescu also is to hold meetings at the Russian Parliament and with Soviet business people. He will describe the results of his visit at a news conference in the Foreign Ministry's press centre.

Gorbachev, Iliescu Hold Talks

LD0504125291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] After a one-on-one conversation between USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Romanian President Iliescu, a conversation involving a larger number of people began.

Taking part in the talks on the Soviet side are:
—Deputy Prime Minister Ryabov,
—Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh,
—Army General Moiseyev, chief of the general staff and first deputy defense minister.

From the Romanian side:
—Foreign Minister Nastase,
—Minister of Natural Management and Environmental Protection Eugen Pop.

Bessmertnykh Comments on Talks

LD0504131491 Moscow TASS in English 1249 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—Soviet-Romanian talks are continuing in the Kremlin. After their one-to-one meeting, presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and Ion Iliescu were joined at the negotiating table by other officials.

Speaking in a TASS interview, Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksander Bessmertnykh said Iliescu's visit is very important to updating the format of the USSR's relations with East European nations.

This is because it offers the possibility of discussing not only the package of bilateral issues but also the situation in the region as a whole, he added.

On bilateral talks, Bessmertnykh said that political issues are not too much of a problem, although they also need to be discussed and studied. The principal problem, however, is economic matters, according to him.

Bessmertnykh described economic relations as an area where much has to be re-thought, including not only past arrangements but also a great deal of what is being done now, under the new model of contacts. Both countries, for example, experienced substantial difficulties when switching over to hard currency payments in bilateral trade, he explained.

Soviet and Romanian involvement in the CSCE process, cooperation in the area of the Black Sea, and the situation on the Balkans also feature prominently at the talks, Bessmertnykh added.

Commenting on the overall state of bilateral relations, he noted the solid groundwork laid for joint action in every sphere, including political, economic and security areas.

Bessmertnykh said that the talks will be crowned by the signing of a treaty of cooperation, goodneighbourly relations and friendship between the USSR and Romania. He summed it up as an agreement of a new type, which is part of the efforts to update the legal basis of relations with East European countries.

From multilateral agreements within the framework of the Warsaw pact, the Soviet Union is proceeding to mostly bilateral accords and contacts, Bessmertnykh said.

This foundation of relations, in his opinion, is stronger as it enables participating countries to feel equal, sovereign and completely secure in legal terms.

Bessmertnykh said that East European nations after the watershed year of 1989 have been able to understand their interests better and decide how they want to build relations with East and West. These countries made their choice and "there was no pressure on them from the USSR", he said.

Bessmertnykh added that the new treaty with Romania will pave the way to similar accords with other East European states, including Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Gorbachev Talks Detailed

LD0504223791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1937 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Excerpt] Moscow, 5 Apr (TASS)—The conversation in the Kremlin today between the top leaders of the Soviet Union and Romania—M.S. Gorbachev and I. Iliescu—was in its way unique. It was not just that the interlocutors, in the course of a friendly and even cordial discussion, unanimously noted the need after the major changes that have occurred in the two countries to not only preserve everything of value that existed in relations between them in the past but also to raise their cooperation to a new level and give a new dynamism to their relations. The presidents also signed a treaty of cooperation, good-neighborliness, and friendship.

This, M.S. Gorbachev noted, is the first treaty of this kind that has been signed of late between the Soviet Union and one of the countries of East Europe. After the revolutionary events of the recent past, there had been a certain pause in our relations with these countries. Evidently they needed to take their bearings and do some thinking, but a year has passed and now everywhere people are beginning to come to the conclusion that we all need each other.

Romania is the first country to have proved ready for the formulation in a treaty of its new relations with the Soviet Union, relations that have become truly equal. The content of our treaty reflects, however, not only the new situation that has come about between our countries. It is a good cornerstone in the edifice of new links between all the East European states and also in the edifice of a new European peaceful order.

President Iliescu added after fully supporting these assessments: There will also be a very broad international response to our treaty because, in conditions of real consideration for each other's interests, it has been signed by two states, one of which is comparatively small, the other a whole continent. This treaty, as it were, symbolizes the changes occurring throughout the whole world.

During the conversation, the first and significant part of which took place on a one-to-one basis, there was a thorough exchange of information and opinions on the situation in both countries. The interlocutors noted that the processes of the transition to a new relationship in economics and politics evidently have a lot in common everywhere. And they create certain problems and difficulties—sometimes considerable—everywhere, and they must be overcome by cooperating and by lending each other mutual support. Iliescu stated that Romania is deeply interested in the success of the transformations begun by M.S. Gorbachev and thinks they are important for advancing Romanian reforms also.

Naturally, the talk touched broadly on the field of bilateral relations. Having highly evaluated their common dynamics and character, the interlocutors also noted certain complexities. Some of them have an objective character and will be overcome in the course of time. But another part is connected with the fact that both sides make far from full use of the existing possibilities. M.S. Gorbachev and I. Iliescu noted that prospects for the national economies of the two countries to mutually supplement each other are on hand, especially in certain sectors. They must be realized by making use of both the new forms of relations and those which were used earlier but on the basis of real mutual advantage. The talk also got round to the prospects for the creation of joint enterprises both on the territory of the USSR and on the territory of Romania. It was noted that the renewal of the Soviet federation creates the basis for the development of ties between Romania and the Soviet republics, first of all with neighboring Ukraine, Moldova, and also Russia and others.

Questions of international policy were touched on and M.S. Gorbachev and I. Iliescu came out in favor of supporting the development of the common European process. They noted that the cooperation of the Balkan countries, countries of the Danube basin, as well as the Black Sea countries could make a certain contribution to its progress, thereby supporting the initiative of T. Ozal, president of the Republic of Turkey.

Certain delicate moments may arise in relations between countries. In this case the approach, Iliescu noted, should be sensible and well-considered and should be based solely upon existing realities. And that means that difficulties should not be created for each other; on the contrary, efforts must be united to overcome them, rejecting any extremism.

M.S. Gorbachev shared this position, assessed the well-considered approaches of the Romanian leadership, and came out in favor of deepening mutual understanding and maintaining permanent contacts on any problems in the appropriate friendly atmosphere.

We will work—the talks ended on this energetic note. The presidents of the two countries agreed to maintain permanent contacts. I. Iliescu invited M.S. Gorbachev to visit Romania. The invitation was accepted with gratitude. [passage omitted]

Meets Yeltsin

LD0504164291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1605 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 5 Apr (TASS)—A meeting has taken place between Ion Iliescu, president of Romania, and Boris Yeltsin, Chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, it was revealed by the press secretariat of the RSFSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. During the meeting, the sides exchanged information on the situation in their countries and on the course of the processes taking place there. The parties expressed the understanding that the dialogue between Russia and Romania should continue in the future.

Holds News Conference

LD0504175391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] Today the Romanian president held a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists. Touching upon Soviet-Romanian negotiations Ion Iliescu said in particular:

[Begin Iliescu recording in Romanian fading into Russian translation] In the course of negotiations with President Mikhail Gorbachev we examined the present stage and especially the future of al spheres of bilateral relations. We also had a broad exchange of views on topical international problems. Of course, we informed each other about the course of internal developments in our countries. I would like to note the spirit of openness, mutual understanding, and mutual respect which characterized our negotiations, and, on the whole, the relaxed atmosphere in which they were held. Both countries revealed their readiness and determination to fight for the development of joint relations on a new basis under new conditions, preserving the positive aspects, and getting rid of the negative elements of the past. The treaty on cooperation, good-neighborliness, and friendship between Romania and the Soviet Union has revealed this determination. It was signed by me and President Gorbachev. We think and regard the treaty on cooperation, good-neighborliness, and friendship as a significant point in the development of cooperation between Romania and the Soviet Union. By this we have transferred relations between Romania and the Soviet Union to a modern basis, which meets the interests of both countries and represents an important contribution to the creation of structures of cooperation in this area of Europe and on the continent as a whole. [end recording]

ROMPRES Reports Conference

AU0604131791 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1053 GMT 6 Apr 91

["Romania's President in Moscow: Ion Iliescu—A Special Moment in the Evolution of Romanian-Soviet Relations"—ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Moscow ROMPRES 6/4/1991—President Iliescu met on Friday afternoon with Romanian and foreign journalists at the news centre of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Romania's president mentioned, in his statement on the occasion, the spirit of openness, understanding and mutual respect of his discussions with Mikhail Gorbachev and the general climate of detente in which those discussions had unfolded. We have expressed the two countries' determination under the today's new conditions, he said among other things, to take steps for the development of our relations on a new, modern and sound basis, by maintaining all positive and constructive aspects and eliminating the negative elements of the past.

We consider that the conclusion of the treaty of collaboration, good neighbourly relations and friendship between Romania and the Soviet Union marks a special moment in the evolution of Romanian-Soviet relations. The treaty gives expression to our two countries' will to act for developing and deepening those relations, placing our collaboration within the framework of the latest developments in Romania and the Soviet Union, as well as in Europe, as part of the effort to build up security and cooperation structures and a European economic and cultural area.

Acknowledging the concept sanctioned by the Paris summit whereby all attending states are considered "friends" as a basis of the new security and peace architecture in Europe, the treaty was modelled after the provisions of the UN Charter, the Helsinki Final Act and the Paris Charter for a New Europe. Thus, relations between Romania and the USSR are placed on a modern basis which serves the interests of both countries, at the same time contributing to the establishment of security and cooperation structures in this part of Europe and on our continent as a whole.

Therefore, the treaty bases the relations between our countries on the respect of the principles of international law and justice, on equity and sovereign equality of rights.

Romania's relations with the Republic of Moldova, to which we are attached by our historical, spiritual, ethnic, linguistic and cultural community, must be seen within the same framework, taking into account the changes currently taking place in our countries and the stands taken by the Romanian and Soviet authorities on events that occurred on the eve of the Second World War in the Soviet Union. We have therefore solid prospects to develop close ties with the Republic of Moldova, as well as with Ukraine, the Russian Federation and other union republics in all fields, by firmly observing the principles of state sovereignty and the peoples' right to self-determination.

I have examined together with President Gorbachev and other members of the Soviet delegation concrete actions meant to entail the development of trade exchanges and economic cooperation between Romania and the Soviet Union. We voiced our joint wish to adopt new, efficient and flexible mutually advantageous forms in promoting exchanges and industrial, technological and scientific cooperation, under the new circumstances, according to the economic potential of the two countries. As far as we are concerned, we are in favour of diversifying our relations and expanding business between Romanian and Soviet companies.

An exchange of letters took place between our Ministries of Foreign Trade about the mechanism of bilateral trade relations implementation, specifically providing for a bank payment arrangement that would contribute to giving a fresh impetus to contracting, export and import activities between economic agents in Romania and the

USSR, so as to carry into effect the commercial agreement signed in December 1990.

A number of projects of economic cooperation in production and sales are under way and we have also identified new ones, which are going to give new dimensions to bilateral relations in the fields of mechanical engineering, civil engineering, capitalization and transfer of resources.

The Soviet side, President Gorbachev, proved interested and declared their readiness to increase the supply of natural gas for the Romanian economy from 8 million cubic meter/day to about 15 million. The Romanian industry will have to ensure instead the counter-party delivery of equipments for the Soviet oil and gas industry, as well as other installations required by Soviet economy.

Both parties agreed to expand cultural and scientific exchanges and promote direct contacts in all fields.

The environment ministers signed a Convention of Collaboration in Environmental Protection, which lays the guidelines and forms of collaboration in the field. The convention provides for the creation of a joint commission and for the development of direct relations and contacts between relevant institutions in the two countries; it supplies a clear framework for bilateral collaboration in the field, as part of our joint effort to protect European environment, specifically in the Black Sea and Danube area.

We have, certainly, made a wide exchange of views on the main international issues. The necessity was highlighted to join efforts in order to consolidate detente, security and peace, the unconditional observance of the unanimously recognized principles of international law in the general relations among states, for a wide cooperation among nations and for the thorough implementation of the provisions included in the CSCE documents, in the Paris Charter for a New Europe.

We have convened to continue the Romanian-Soviet dialogue. To that end I have extended President Mikhail Gorbachev the invitation to visit Romania. In the spirit of the principles governing the treaty, I have had a useful meeting and discussion with Mr. Boris Yeltsin, president of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, with whom I tackled topics relating to the development of relations between Romania and the Russian Federation in various fields, chiefly in the economic one, given the growing responsibilities of the republics in their new relations with the centre. For that purpose we have agreed to draft and sign within the first half of this year a trade and economic collaboration accord, as well as a programme of cultural collaboration.

Moldova, Other Issues Discussed

AU0604150691 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1205 GMT 6 Apr 91

["Romania's President in Moscow: Ion Iliescu—The Treaty Does Not Mortgage Our Future"—ROMPRES headline]

[Text] Moscow ROMPRES 6/4/1991—Answering a Hungarian journalist's question about a certain tendency of the Republic of Moldova to leave the union and become part of Romania and about how that tendency was reflected by the treaty, the head of the Romanian state said:

"The treaty has taken into account the processes which are now taking place in the Soviet Union, namely the assertion of sovereignty by the republics and the higher responsibilities they have in their direct relations with other states.

"It is well-known that the Republic of Moldova proclaimed its state independence and it is within that framework that bilateral relations developed. The fact, was correctly understood by the central leadership of the Soviet Union as a necessary objective process. Exchanges and visits have taken place between us, even President Snegur and Moldova's prime minister have visited Bucharest and some of our own ministers visited Moldova. Our minister of foreign affairs has recently signed an agreement on the relations between the two states. Here are, so to speak, two Romanian states acting, in a certain sense, as state structures. We are taking into account what has always occurred in politics, today's concrete realities, in keeping with the principles that govern the relations between the European states. Therefore, political actions are determined by reason and realism rather than by wishes and feelings which, however, ought not to be ignored."

Replying to a question put by the daily "ADEVARUL" envoy voicing some opinions that the treaty would go against Romania's and Moldova's interests and would mortgage their future, President Iliescu said:

"It is an unrealistic position and appreciation because two states must have relations, all the more when they are neighbours, and all lucid minds in the Romanian political life pleaded for placing relations with our neighbours on normal bases, so as to ensure good neighbourly contacts, mutual confidence and an active collaboration at all levels. That principle governs this fundamental treaty which essentially differs from any we've so far had with the Soviet Union, including the last treaty whose validity ended today. Not to conclude a new treaty would have meant keeping the old one in force, which fully disagreed with the principles now governing European relations. The present treaty is based on the new general-European principles and in no way mortgages the future of the Republic of Moldova or, in general, that of any territory ever inhabited by Romanians. It is a matter of history, of life. There are cases when the possibility of a settlement is open by observing international generally-admitted norms, peacefully, without resorting to force in solving frontier or any other problems."

Asked what would happen to Romania's treasures still held by the Soviet Union, President Ion Iliescu replied:

"It is common knowledge that during the first world war Romania placed in the banks of Russia part of its treasure and of its gold reserve in ingots and other golden valuables. Later, Romania negotiated with the Soviet Union the return of that treasure. Negotiations proved fruitless at the time, under the pretext that the treasure could not be found. In the years '50 Romania got back what we call "the Pietroasa Treasure." [brood hen with golden fledglings dating back to fourth century] Other components of the original treasure have not been recovered to this day. We have approached the issue with President Gorbachev and asked research be made together. He said he knew nothing oı it and that he would look into the matter. He received well our proposal that research be resumed jointly in order to settle the problem."

Another question referred to the Serpent Island. This is what President Iliescu replied:

"It is a political rather than a geographical issue. The Island is quite small, about 17 hectares. It used to have rather a strategical importance because it controlled the Danube mouths. It holds a lighthouse for navigation in the area.

"Throughout history, the island belonged to those who owned the Danube mouths and the Danube Delta. It belonged to Romania.

"In 1940, when, after the Soviet Government's ultimatum, Bessarabia and other territories that had never belonged to anyone but us—Northern Bukovina and the Hertsa region—the Serpent Island was left in Romania's possession as part of the Danube Delta. The Paris conference of 1947 recognized the borders of 1940 and, therefore, the island remained Romanian property.

Later, in 1948, a protocol which established the frontiers of the two countries also tracing the border line along the deepest water line as was then the practice on the Danube, was added a "mention" stipulating that the Serpent Island became part of the Soviet Union's territory.

The issue was set forth by the Romanian side a few years ago, when talks started about tracing the border line in territorial waters and in the Black Sea economic zone between the Soviet Union and Romania. Today, I have introduced the matter to President Gorbachev, who said he was not familiar with the problem. He promised to give explanations and that he would consider our claim."

Answering a question about Romania's being the first East European state to conclude a new treaty with the Soviet Union, President Iliescu Said:

"We are aware negotiations are under way with other states as well. The Soviet side informed us that Poland's prime minister had recently been to Moscow to conclude a draft treaty, while negotiations with the Hungarians were in an advanced stage. I think President Gorbachev is most entitled to give you an answer. The drafting of the treaty was the fertile work of diplomats and took several months, because they started from a Romanian draft and a Soviet draft. Bilateral negotiations followed in order to near the two variants and we have reached the present formula accepted by the two parties. Both parties contemplate with satisfaction the bases of the present treaty which will not only serve our interests but will be a model of modern and fair relations between two states.

Iliescu Departs 6 April

LD0604113791 Moscow TASS in English 1059 GMT 6 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Lyudmila Shvedova and Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—President Ion Iliescu of Romania, on a working visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of President Mikhail Gorbachev, left the Soviet Union today.

Soviet Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev and other officials saw him off at the airport.

The results of Iliescu's Moscow talks confirmed the need to expand and upgrade bilateral relations.

Iliescu and Gorbachev signed an agreement on cooperation and friendship—the first such document signed between the Soviet Union and an East European country.

Winding up his stay in Moscow, Iliescu met Soviet business representatives at Moscow International Trade Centre today.

The sides discussed new ways of economic cooperation and new types of relations based on mutual advantage.

Iliescu Interviewed After Visit

LD0604182491 Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 6 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Dyakov]

[Text] Bucharest April 6 TASS—President Ion Iliescu of Romania said his visit to the Soviet Union was fruitful and produced exceptional results.

In a TASS interview upon his arrival at Otopeni Airport today, Iliescu stressed that a treaty of cooperation, good neighbourliness and friendship, signed during the visit, was a document of major importance and the very fact of its signing an important political element in the two countries' life and in international terms.

It is important to note that the talk with President Mikhail Gorbachev was of a frank and friendly nature, Iliescu said. He pointed out that they discussed a wide range of issues and examined several specific proposals concerning the strengthening of bilateral cooperation.

Iliescu emphasised that the meeting with a group of Soviet specialists and businessmen was also useful. During the meeting, the sides discussed issues related to the implementation of reforms and the transition of the two countries' economies to market relations.

Iliescu described the decision to establish Romania's direct contacts with Soviet Union republics as a new element in relations with the USSR.

During the talk with Russian legislature chairman Boris Yeltsin, we decided to boost cooperation with this republic and prepare a joint agreement to develop economic, trade and cultural ties, Iliescu said.

Polish Prime Minister Discusses Moscow Talks

LD0704214691 Moscow International Service in Polish 1600 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Interview with Polish Prime Minister Jan Krzysztof Bielecki by correspondent Leonid Siganov in Moscow; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Siganov] Mr. Premier, how do you evaluate the [word indistinct] course of the talks that have, in fact, only just ended?

[Bielecki] The atmosphere I evaluate as good. I think that we spoke in a fast, down-to-earth language devoid of unnecessary conventions that, especially on a working visit, drag out the time spent on talks or the time of the negotiations. Thanks to this, too, we were able to discuss a whole list of matters, and there were very many of these matters, precisely in the political basket, in the economic basket, and in the cultural basket.

[Siganov] Mr. Premier, were some concrete decisions attained during the current visit?

[Bielecki] We should see the concrete decisions, or not, during the discussion that is in progress at the moment, concurrently with our meetings here, and that is being continued by part of our delegation, specifically Foreign Economic Relations Minister Ledworowski, and the plenipotentiary for matters of indebtedness, and Deputy Finance Minister Janusz Sawicki, with Premier Kashlev and Deputy Premier Sitaryan.

[Siganov] Some are only to bear fruit in the future?

[Bielecki] No, no, that means the will of both sides was for the visit to bring concrete decisions, not only in the form of political decisions which mark out a certain timetable for concrete steps that will be taken in the coming time, but also that we should agree on certain things that are indispensable for economic cooperation between our countries to be able to develop. So, I envisage very concrete decisions.

[Siganov] When might we expect the signing of a new treaty between our countries, for which everyone is now waiting [word indistinct]?

[Bielecki] Yes, but I have already said, during the news conference, that this is not a race; this is a treaty that will mark out our relations for 20 years. Regarding this, it must be very well prepared, all the details negotiated through, as there must be prepared a treaty regarding the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Poland, an agreement on the subject of transit, and an agreement relating to the accounting of the fixtures left behind by the Soviet Army in Poland.

[Siganov] Mr. Premier, during every negotiation, there are subjects that are easier and then the so-called difficult ones. What, in your view, were the more straightforward ones? What were the more difficult ones?

[Bielecki] The most straightforward were those that it was possible to arrange quickly. I am thinking here, above all, of the need for us to open cultural and consular centers in many republics. We agreed upon this. Also, the talks on economic subjects were probably easy, overall, although the issue of accounting aroused a series of doubts on both sides. On the other hand, a more difficult matter relates, of course, to the issue of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Poland. Our stand is well known to you. The Soviet side has a different one. I think that seeking a compromise will facilitate precisely the timetable of the withdrawal of forces, that will allow for the specification of how fast the Soviet side proposes the withdrawal of fighting units, which are the ones we are particularly interested in.

[Siganov] [Words indistinct] How did the Premier feel here, in Moscow?

[Bielecki] This is my second visit in 14 years. Once, I was a tourist; this time, I have come with an official delegation, so this is to find oneself in the same city but in a completely different role. On the other hand, how do I find it? We have been in the very beautiful Arbat, and I feel that this city also requires a dynamic economic reform, that will introduce this indispensable enlivenment onto the streets of this city, as well.

[Siganov] Thank you, Mr. Premier. Thank you.

West Europe

Falin Meets With Swedish Left Party Official

PM0804090791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] V.M. Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received B. Mabrink, member of the Left Party of Sweden and chairman of its parliamentary group, 4 April. During a friendly talk questions of domestic political life in the Soviet Union and key international problems were discussed. There was also an exchange of opinions on the prospects for the development of cooperation between Europe's left-wing forces on questions of interparty relations.

Dzasokhov Meets Spanish Party Leaders

LD0504085491 Moscow TASS in English 0819 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] Madrid April 5 TASS—Chairman of the Soviet Parliament Committee on International Affairs Alexander Dzasokhov, who is secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Committee, on Thursday met members of the secretariat of the ruling Spanish Socialist Labour Party (PSOE).

Dzasokhov is attending the forum of legislators from European and North American states in Madrid.

In the traditional spirit of active cooperation between Soviet Communists and Spanish Socialists, the sides exchanged information on views and approaches to processes in Spain and the Soviet Union.

PSOE leaders stressed their support for democratic changes in the Soviet Union, assessing them as important for the Soviet Union and significant for European processes.

They favoured the perestroyka programme and the territorial integrity of the Soviet Union, which fully conforms to the principles and spirit of the Paris Charter for a New Europe and the Final Act signed by the heads of state and government of the 34 member-countries of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The PSOE leaders displayed great interest in the recent Soviet nationwide referendum and expressed hope that its results would lay a moral and legal basis to improve the Soviet Federation.

In addition, the referendum results are impetus to implement programmes for trade and economic cooperation with the USSR. They show the Soviet Union's readiness for integration into the world economy.

For his part, Dzasokhov outlined the CPSU's appraisal of the present stage in perestroyka and approaches to pressing international issues.

Later in the day, Dzasokhov met Spanish Communist party leader Julio Anguita. Anguita told Dzasokhov about the work of Spanish communists to protect the social interests of working people and to tackle tasks on cooperation between and joint efforts by left-wing forces in Europe.

The Spanish Communist Party leader described the participation of communist deputies in the operation of the Spanish Parliament, as well as Spanish Communists' work on theoretical and practical issues of socialism at the present stage.

Anguita voiced support for the establishment of regular contacts between left-wing forces in Europe.

Dzasokhov expressed confidence that friendship and solidarity between Soviet and Spanish Communists, the Soviet and Spanish peoples would grow in strength and scope in the interests of peace, democracy and socialism.

Departs Madrid 6 Apr

LD0604212391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1530 GMT 6 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Robert Serebrennikov]

[Excerpt] Madrid, 6 Apr (TASS)—The Soviet legislative delegation headed by A.S. Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for International Affairs, today departed Madrid for home. [passage omitted]

General Staff Chief Receives Portuguese Envoy

PM0504151391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Mar 91 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Meeting Held"]

[Text] Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, received A.L. da Costa Lobo, Portuguese ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request 28 March.

During a conversation they touched on problems of European security and the increased role of the United Nations and its military structures in averting and resolving regional military conflicts.

The meeting took place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and goodwill.

TASS Commentator Views Soviet-German Treaty

LD0404200291 Moscow TASS in English 1849 GMT 4 Apr 91

[By TASS commentator Vladimir Sergeyev]

[Text] Moscow April 4 TASS—The Soviet parliament on Tuesday [3 April] ratified the Soviet-German treaty on conditions of deployment and stage-by-stage withdrawal of Soviet troops from German territory and the agreement on some interim measures concerning the entire set of problems relating to the temporary deployment of Soviet troops on German territory.

In this way, the Soviet parliament completed the ratification of the whole package of Soviet-German treaties already ratified by the Bundestag, having settled key problems in relations between our countries.

Problems connected with the deployment of Soviet troops in Germany were in the focus of attention both in the Soviet Union and in Germany. Their solution required political tact from the German side. Chancellor Helmut Kohl and Foreign Minister Hans Dietriech Genscher repeatedly stated they were ready to do the utmost to see Soviet servicemen return home as friends of the German people.

It is only fair to note that much has already been done for the purpose. Much of what the treaties between the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic contained was incorporated into the treaty on Soviet troops in Germany. It also took into account provisions of the treaties between Germany and Western states, whose troops are deployed on German territory, and post- war international human rights conventions. The status of Soviet troops and other parameters are comparable with those of troops of other countries in Germany. This prompts a conclusion that the treaty provides for adequate conditions of Soviet troops' deployment and withdrawal from Germany.

Certain material pre-conditions have also been created. Under the agreement on interim measures, Germany earmarks 15 billion marks for the purpose. The lion's share of this sum—7.8 billion Marks—will go to build housing in the Soviet Union for those Soviet servicemen and their dependents who will return home from Germany.

The newly-ratified Soviet-German treaties meet the Soviet Union's vital interests in ensuring its security in a new Europe on the threshold of the 21st century. They enable the Soviet Union to join the nascent structures of cooperation in Europe with the assistance of united Germany.

The package of German treaties creates favourable conditions for overcoming economic reform difficulties in the Soviet Union.

Supreme Soviet

Moscow TV Details 4 April Proceedings

LD0504223491

Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 2245 GMT on 4 April, following immediately on its report on the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, in its "At the USSR Supreme Soviet" program carries a report on the proceedings of the USSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow on 4 April. Lukyanov and Laptev are shown chairing the session at different times.

The announcer says over video of the session in progress that the Supreme Soviet took just a few minutes to adopt a resolution putting the law on general foundations of entrepreneurship into effect. Voting board shows 329 for, 27 against, and 26 abstentions.

The announcer says that a refined draft resolution on the situation in the agrarian sector on the eve of spring field work was debated. Gukasov, deputy chairman of the Committee for Agrarian Issues and Food, is shown reporting on various deputies' proposals for amendments. The resolution was adopted after a two-hour debate, with further amendments, the announcer says.

Three deputies are shown speaking on their amendments to the agriculture resolution, which the announcer says were incorporated into the version adopted.

At 2301 GMT Lukyanov asks Kucherenko, chairman of the Soviet of Union's Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission, to report on a letter addressed to President Gorbachev, signed by Kucherenko himself, the minister of finance, and the chairman of the state bank, pointing out problems with implementing the budget and asking for the Supreme Soviet to adopt an appeal to republican Supreme Soviets on the issue.

Kucherenko then speaks:

"Esteemed comrade deputies! You remember that we planned to consider at this session progress in implementing the budget for the first quarter and we will do this when the figures are finally added up around 20-25 April as we have agreed. At the same time while considering this we will obviously have to examine the sources of the incomes and perhaps changes in the expenditure that we have confirmed—in other words the possibility of our having to adopt certain amendments to the budget is not ruled out.

"Events are currently developing in such a way—as you have no doubt discovered from the memorandum—that in addition to those measures taken by the president at the Federation Council, we must appeal to the Supreme Soviets of the Union republics to focus their attention on financial issues.

"What is actually taking place in our country now? I wil give you several relevant figures based on preliminary information. During the first quarter we were to have received into the Union budget 54 billion rubles [R]. We expect, well we are effectively receiving between R18.5 billion and R19 billion. The resulting deficit is R35 billion. That is as far as income is concerned. Where are the shortfalls in the income we have received?

"Both in sales taxes, in contributions from the tax on profits, and also in funds channeled specially and separately from the republics for all-Union programs. Thus, we are short R35 billion.

"On the expenditures affected in the first quarter, these expenditures have had to be cut by almost 25 percent. Nevertheless, even with this reduced expenditure, we needed to spend R65 billion and we spent R51 billin, and our overall deficit for the budget as a whole actually came out at almost R33 billion.

"What were we supposed to receive in total from the republics for the year, when the budget was being formed? According to the economic agreement that was signed by the leaders of the republics and the sources established for revenue and the channelling of their expenditure in the Union budget, we were supposed to receive R188 billion. Then, after a certain time, the republics made their proposals to the Ministry of Finance, or rather their amendments, stating they report that they can only contribute R64 billion to the Union budget. Thus the Union budget will be short by R123 billion for the year if things continue as they are now.

"The question arises ol the amounts for each republic. I have to tell you that this concerns virtually all the republics. Of course, the republics that make a bigger contribution to the budget have a bigger share of contribution shortfalls, and those with a smaller contribution have a smaller shortfall. There are also certain objective reasons. These are connected with the recession in production which is greater than we anticipated—we expected a two percent recession in output, and it is running at the level of five or six percent, and there were certain delays in introducing sales tax and a whole number of such measures. If this objective shortfall in revenue been evenly distributed in the country, we would not be experiencing as drastic a shortfall as we now are.

"What is the government doing now? The government is, for the time being, taking credits to implement the programs that we have endorsed and in general to implement budget provisions, and is using the method of cutting expenditure. Suffice it to say that the budget-run organizations that are financed by us have currently been given more money only for wages and a total of a quarter of the expenses that they were supposed to get for other areas and other needs in the first quarter. So there is very serious pressure with regard to these expenses.

"How has this proceeded locally? The analysis shows that leaders of the Ministries of Finance of Republics, heads of banks, sometimes of their own will, give commands to the banks that are situated on the republics' territory not to pay money over to the Union budget, and sometimes to pay it to separate accounts and to freeze it there until they get special instructions. Such revenues as foreign economic activity are sometimes completely frozen within the republics, and do not come in. That is, a very complicated situation is emerging with the budget.

"The situation is no better with the stabilization fund. To be frank, we have received virtually nothing for the stabilization fund over this period of time, and the expenditures that were planned from the stabilization fund to support unprofitable enterprises and to develop the fuel and power industry and other industries are, for the present, proceeding using credit.

"This is the reason for the memorandum that was sent to the president; the president has prepared a draft decree, and according to our best information, they intend to have an objective discussion of these issues at the Federation Council.

"Are there ways to escape this? There are, with a harmonized... [changes thought] if they are implemented in the country, then the basic guidelines that were adopted by us, and the economic agreement where it is written that our country has a unified and inviolable credit and finance policy, which is in fact being destroyed at the moment in this context, then a catastrophe can be avoided. And this is were the catastrophe is approaching from: If these R123 billion or R130 billion do not come into the Union budget, we can make cuts of something like R20 billion or R30 billion, but we cannot fail to finance all our programs like Chernobyl and Aral, we cannot fail to finance science—and we spend something on the order of R14 bilion to R15 billion—we cannot fail to finance all the administrative bodies that exist, and in the final analysis, we canot fail to finance the Army. We will in the final analysis start issuing these finances by taking credit, while the monies that stay at the bottom will also be put to use, because as you can understand, there is no spare money in the republics, and in general there is no spare money. Of course they will find applications for it, and in the goods market, both the food market and the market in manufactured goods for the population, in the production market as a whole, the R123 billion to R130 billion will be after the same goods. That is planned hyperinflation, that is planned undermining of our country's economy. We must not permit this, whatever happens, because that is when a collapse such as we have not even dreamed of will occur. That is why we have proposed to you this appeal to the Supreme Soviets, in order for us to engage in the process of eliminating these negative phenomena that are posed for us now by credit and finance policy and do so not only via executive authorities but also via Supreme Soviets. That is all I have to say."

The announcer says that the appeal was adopted after an exchange of opinions.

Pavlov, deputy chairman of the committee on legislation, legality, and law and order, is shown reporting on the draft law on foundations of criminal legislation in the USSR and union republics, giving details of various sections of it and comparing it with current legislation.

The announcer gives details of several appointments to the Cabinet of Ministers which have been endorsed by the Supreme Soviet. The chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology was also confirmed in his post.

The announcer says that the session will continue on 5 April, and the program ends.

Session Summarized

LD0504152291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Apr 91

[Text] The Union legislature today summed up the results of the discussions held in the Supreme Soviet during debate of the law on entrepreneurial activity by citizens in the USSR, and the situation in agriculture and urgent measures for field work preparations. The new variants of draft resolutions submitted to the deputies on these issues took account of the amendments and addenda made by many deputies. We shall say from the start that both documents were adopted by a majority of votes, even though a trenchant polemic flared up when the resolution on the agrarian sector was going through point by point, especially in respect to the material and social provisions made in it. The disputes and the divergent evaluations essentially amount, briefly, to the following: deputies are of the opinion that fundamental changes in the countryside may be expected after the agrarian reform, and the time schedule for introducing that must be speeded up.

The Supreme Soviet was no less concerned about the progress of implementation of the country's budget in the first quarter of this year, and the growing deficit. Detailed discussion is still to come. Today, however, the deputies stated that the failure by some union republics, including the Russian Federation, to fulfill the obligations they have undertaken, is having a serious impact upon the formation of the budget and the financing of a number of major social programs.

The USSR Supreme Soviet adopted an appeal to the legislatures of all the union republics, calling upon them to prevent negative tendencies in the sphere of finance and credit and monetary relations from getting any stronger. To do this, decisions adopted by the republics that are at variance with all-Union legislation must cease to be effective before the new Union treaty is signed. This will make it possible to halt the country's slide into financial chaos and to avert further deterioration of the people's life.

A new draft law was then examined, on the bases of the criminal legislation of the USSR and the union republics. This was its first reading in the legislature. Pavlov, deputy chairman of the committee on legislation, law and order and the fight against crime, delivered a lengthy analytical report reviewing the draft law's main statutes. He gave quite thorough replies to deputies' questions. It was decided to hold debates on this legal act at separate sittings of the chambers tomorrow. The formation of the union Cabinet of Ministers continued today. The Supreme Soviet gave its agreement to the appointment of the heads of a number of ministries coming under union subordination. Oleg Nikolayevich Shishkin will head the Ministry of General Machine-building; Nikolay Andreyevich Pugin will head the Ministry of Motor Vehicle and Agricultural Machine-building; Boris Mikhaylovich Belousov will head the Ministry of the Defense Industry; Boris Yegorovich Panyukov will head the Ministry of Civilian Aviation.

The latter, incidentally, was asked the greatest number of questions; for all of us have far too many criticisms to make of Aeroflot. The candidate nevertheless passed this difficult test.

Today's very full day ended with the final ratification of the membership of the Committee for Science and Technology. Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhov remained its chairman.

Criminal Law Examined

LD0504170291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1604 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, 5 Apr (TASS)—Today, at separate sessions of its chambers, the USSR Supreme Soviet gave a first reading to draft foundations for the criminal legislation of the USSR and the union republics.

Presenting the document, Aleksandr Pavlov, a member of the legislative Committee on Legislation, Law and Order, and the Struggle Against Crime, stressed the more liberal character of the foundations compared with the criminal legislation currently in force. For instance, the maximum prison sentence for especially serious crimes will now be 10 years. A sentence of 15 years can only be imposed if it is a substitute for the death penalty as a result of the granting of clemency. Furthermore, the imposition of the death penalty—by shooting—will only be allowed as a "supreme punishment" in cases of "state treason, an act of terrorism, premeditated murder in aggravating circumstances, and also for war crimes and genocide." According to Aleksandr Pavlov, until recently, under existing legislation, the death penalty was being imposed for serious crimes against property.

He noted that the document submitted to the deputies envisages a certain reduction in terms of imprisonment for convicts. Greater use will be made of administrative punishments—fines and so on.

In giving a first reading to the draft foundations of criminal legislation, the deputies decided to pass them on to legislative committees and commissions for further refinement.

Privatization Bill Deferred

LD0504171891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1622 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 5 Apr (TASS)—Today, at separate sessions of its chambers, the USSR Supreme Soviet studied the first reading of a bill on the basic principles of the denationalization and privatization of enterprises. Presenting the document to the deputies, Vladimir Shcherbakov, USSR deputy prime minister, said that the reform of ownership in the Soviet Union is the most complex question arising out of the emergence of a market economy. He asserted that this is because over 90 percent of all property in the country is currently in the hands of the state. According to the deputy prime minister, the bill sets out conditions and procedures for the denationalization and privatization of all-Union state enterprises. A state assets fund now being set up will carry out the privatization of all-Union assets. The privatization of property in the republics will be regulated by republican legislation. [passage omitted]

A number of deputies proposed that the adoption of the bill at its first reading be deferred, saying that privatization will only increase the chaos in the economy. As a result, the bill was adopted by the Soviet of the Union, but did not win enough votes in the second chamber, the Soviet of Nationalities. A final decision is to be made next week.

Finance Team Reveals Dismal Budget Problems

PM0504231191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

[IZVESTIYA legislative correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev report from the Kremlin: "USSR Supreme Soviet: How Can the Budget Crisis Be Eliminated]

[Text] A few days ago a letter addressed to the USSR President and signed by V. Kucherenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Budget, Planning, and Financial Commission; V. Orlov, the country's minister of finance; and V. Gerashchenko, chairman of the USSR Gosbank [State Bank], was circulated in the legislature. The "letter of the three" depicts the utterly catastrophic situation that has taken shape in the implemention of the union budget.

According to preliminary data, union budget income during the first two months of the current year totaled 13.4 billion rubles [R] instead of the R36.2 billion planned. Budget expenditure exceeded budget income by R18.2 billion. The main problem in the implementation of the Union budget, the letter points out, is ensuring the income side of the budget. This is due mainly to the fact that individual union republics have adopted their own legislative acts on the distribution of budget incomes obtained on their territory, and that these acts are at variance with union legislation.

According to the USSR Gosbank, as of 1 March of the current year, only R7 billion had been received from union republic territories against the plan figure of R23.4 billion, or 30 percent of union budget income. Russia, the Ukraine, and the Baltic Republics accounted for the bulk of the payments that have not been made into the union budget.

The formation of the unionwide extrabudgetary fund to stabilize the economy to which, by agreement, union republics are supposed to contribute R48.8 billion is also evoking serious concern. By mid-March essentially no contributions had been paid into the fund. As a result the funding of central capital investments, the allocation of subsidies to republics, payment of subsidies to enterprises, and the implementation of conversion and of scientific research in the agro-industrial complex, the light industry, and elsewhere is in jeopardy.

All that has been said so far indicates that what has been happening from the first days of the current year is essentially the liquidation of the union budget's income base, and the impossibility of funding approved union expenditure means that the country is faced with a catastrophe, with the actual disintegration of the Union. Any further delay in enforcement of legislative stipulations on implementation of an integrated finance, credit, and monetary policy is impermissible, the letter says, because there are no means in the budget to fund expenditure of virtually any kind during the second quarter, including the funding of the national economy and the social sphere, maintenance of the army, and implementation of the "Chernobyl," "Aral," and other programs.

In view of the catastrophic consequences of the situation that is taking shape in the sphere of finance, credit, and monetary relations, the letter says, we must discuss these questions at the Federation Council as a matter of urgency.

The "letter of the three" proposes that, in the event of the nonfulfillment or systematic violation of the distribution of incomes between the various types of budget as laid down under union legislation, the leaders of republic central bank institutions be removed from their posts. To set up a USSR Gosbank central council, it is recommended that the chairman of the country's Gosbank be granted the right to exercise the powers of this council in the implementation of an integrated state policy in the sphere of money circulation, credits, settlement of accounts, foreign currency relations, safeguarding of the stability of the ruble, and protection of the interests of creditors and depositors of all the banks on the territory of the USSR.

At a joint session of the chambers held 4 April, deputies heard a report on this question. It was delivered by V. Kucherenko, one of the coauthors of the letter.

Under the economic agreement that was signed by republic leaders and which defined the restoration of the sources of revenue and the channeling of this revenue into union budget expenditure, we were to receive R188 billion, Kucherenko emphasized. Then the republics submitted to the USSR Ministry of Finance their corrections, from which they contributed only R64 billion to the union budget.

Naturally, many people would like to know which republics are the debtors and how much they owe. Practically all the republics are involved. What are the reasons for this situation? According to Kucherenko, this is connected with the slump in production, which has proved more serious than expected. In addition, the chairman of the Budget, Planning, and Financial Commission believes the effect of a certain delay in the introduction of the sales tax is also being felt.

What has happened at local level? Leaders of republic ministries of finance and bank leaders, Kucherenko noted in his report, have instructed their banks either not to transfer payments to the union budget or to transfer them to special accounts and "freeze" them there until they receive special instructions.

The situation as regards the stabilization fund is no better.

Is there any way to resolve this problem? There is, Kucherenko believes. Provided that the basic guidelines and the economic agreement are implemented in the country, it is possible to avoid a catastrophe.

Union legislators adopted an appeal to republic Supreme Soviets.

Then Deputy A. Pavlov, representing the Legislation and Law and Order Committee, delivered a report on the draft Fundamentals of Criminal Legislation of the USSR, and Union Republics submitted for the first reading. The debate on this document will take place at separate sittings of the chambers.

In the evening of 4 April the Union legislature endorsed the appointment of four candidates for ministerial posts proposed by the USSR president: O. Shishkin (minister of general machine building) aged 57; N. Pugin (minister of automobile and agricultural machine building), aged 51; B. Belousov (minister of defense industry), aged 57; and B. Panyukov (minister of civil aviation), aged 61, have joined the country's Cabinet of Ministers.

After that the session participants returned to the resolution on bringing into effect the law on the procedure for the settlement of individual labor disputes and the law on the introduction of amendments and additions to USSR legislative acts dealing with labor. The documents were passed without a debate.

Finally, only on their third attempt, and again only after a fraught debate, deputies approved the composition of the Committee for Science and Technologies headed by Academician Yu. Ryzhov.

The session participants will now meet for a joint sitting on Monday 8 April.

'Extract' From Letter to Gorbachev

PM0504232791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

[Extract from appeal to USSR President: "Our Digest; What Is Being Said and Written"]

[Text] From the appeal to the USSR President by V. Kucherenko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union Budget, Planning, and Financial Commission, V. Orlov, USSR minister of finance, and V. Gerashchenko, chairman of the USSR State Bank:

"We deem it necessary to brief you on the extremely unsatisfactory situation which has taken shape in the implementation of the Union budget in the current year.

"...The main problem in the implementation of the Union budget for the current year is ensuring the income side of the budget, caused mainly by the fact that individual union republics, and above all the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], have adopted their own legislative acts on the distribution of budget income and are at variance with Union legislation.

"...The RSFSR, Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], and the Baltic republics account for the bulk of the payments that have not been made to the Union budget.

"The RSFSR Ministry of Finance and the RSFSR Central Bank have instructed local financial organs and banks by cables dated 27 December 1990 and 3 January 1991 that by way of temporary measures applying during the first quarter of 1991 all incomes from the territory of the RSFSR are to be channeled mainly into the republic budget, and specified amounts to local budgets. An instruction has been issued that Union budget incomes are to remain in a separate account of the RSFSR Central Bank until further notification.

"...During the past two months the RSFSR Ministry of Finance has transmitted around 4 billion rubles [R] to the Union budget, which totals only 26 percent of the sum due to be paid into the Union budget during these months in taxes, duties, and direct payments defined in the Agreement for 1991.

"...As a result of nonparticipation in the formation of Union budget incomes, the Baltic republics have failed to transmit more than R700 million. The Lithuanian Republic Ministry of Finance instructed banks 4 January 1991 to close all USSR budget accounts and warned enteprises that sanctions would be applied to them should they transmit incomes to the Union budget.

"The Republic of Georgia failed to pay R150 million, and the SSR Moldova failed to pay R90 million into the Union budget during the two months.

"If these actions on the part of the republics continue, the Union budget shortfall for the year will total R123.1 billion, or almost half its total income, of which R105.2 billion is from the RSFSR and R7 billion from the Ukrainian SSR.

"...Any further delay in actions to ensure compliance with legislative stipulations for the implementation of an integrated financial, credit, and monetary policy is impermissible because there are no means in the budget to cover virtually any expenditure in the second quarter, including funding of the national economy and the social spehre, maintenance of the army, and implementation of the 'Chernobyl,' 'Aral,' and other programs."

(The appeal has been circulated as an official document at the USSR Supreme Soviet).

Appeal to Republic Counterparts

PM0704140391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

[Appeal signed in Moscow on 4 April: "USSR Supreme Soviet Appeal to Republic Supreme Soviets"]

[Text] Esteemed People's Deputies!

We are prompted to appeal to you by the possible extremely grave consequences of the abnormal situation prevailing with regard to the implementation of the union budget and the funding of social programs in the current year. According to preliminary data, the union budget's income during the first quarter was fulfilled to the tune of just over one-third of the planned sums. There will have been a shortfall of more than 35 billion rubles during this period alone. The income of the USSR Pension Fund is not being ensured in similar proportions. This is a result, above all, of the fact that the legislative acts of a number of republics with regard to the distribution of the budget income received on their territories contravene union legislation and the agreement for 1991 on stabilizing the socioeconomic situation in the country adopted by the USSR president and the leaders of the republics' top organs of state power.

It is perfectly obvious that the state cannot halt the funding of current expenditure, nor of adopted and announced programs, particularly social ones—to improve pensions, assistance for families with children, employment of the population, and others. To prevent this from happening, the USSR Ministry of Finance was compelled to apply for bank credit. Unfortunately, this way out of the present situation is fraught with serious new complications. Additional credit resources and cash are rushing into our unbalanced market essentially in doubled quantities. If the situation does not change, as a result we will enter a spiral of hyperinflation with all the ensuing devastating consequences for the national economy and the material position of the population both throughout the country and in each individual republic.

We urge you to use all your high prestige and powers to suspend the decisions adopted in the republics insofar as they run counter to all-union legislation and the agreement on stabilizing the socioeconomic situation in the country in the sphere of financial and credit-money relations and to ensure the formation of the USSR Pension Fund, the USSR Social Insurance Fund, and the State Fund to Promote Employment pending the signing of the new Union Treaty and the bringing of legislation on these questions into line with it.

We express hopes for mutual understanding and support in halting the country's slide toward financial chaos and preventing a further deterioration of the people's life.

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Kremlin, Moscow, 4 April 1991.

Lukyanov Interviewed on Sessions' Work

LD0704222391 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Interview with USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov by correspondent Y. Tolstykh in Moscow; date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Tolstykh] Anatoliy Ivanovich, what is your view of the progress being made by the current session of the Supreme Soviet? In my view, it is adopting very important decisions. For instance, today it has been discussing the question of privatization. Yesterday, it was discussing entrepreneurship in the USSR. How do you evaluate this work?

[Lukyanov] The work of parliament cannot be separated from the life of society, from the problems of society. Therefore, the tension in society, the difficulties in society, and the heightening of social tension are all inseparable. All this has an impact on the work of the Supreme Soviet. Therefore, during this session we have already examined questions connected with price reform, with the miners' strikes, and with the demonstrations in Moscow. We have studied in ver great detail very lengthy reports on the course of spring sowing work. In other words, the worries being experienced by the country have been reflected in the work of the Supreme Soviet, on the same scale of intensity and tension.

A very great deal of work concerned international affairs. We studied and ratified treaties concluded by the Soviet Union with France, Italy, and the FRG. This also took up quite a lot of time.

I think that, at the same time, work will continue: We are concluding the formation of the Cabinet of Ministers. In particular, we have adopted the law on the Cabinet of Ministers, on the list of union ministries. I think that by the end of this month we will have completed this work.

[Tolstykh] This interview will be screened on 7 April, on Easter Day. Would you like to say anything special to viewers about this day?

[Lukyanov] In the first place, Easter is also a Slavonic festival, a festival of spring, of renewal in society. Indeed, we are renewing society at the moment, trying to keep it within peaceful confines and trying to prevent confrontation. But, we are renewing society, and, therefore, one would very much like all forces throughout society to be consolidated. This is the most important guarantee that we will continue, following the path which has been charted.

Political & Social

Pugo Cancels Appointment by RSFSR Minister

LD0704111891 Moscow TASS in English 1109 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—USSR Interior Minister Boris Pugo has cancelled an order issued by Viktor Barannikov, minister of the interior of the Russian Federation, about the appointment of Vyacheslav Komissarov to be the head of the main department of internal affairs for Moscow.

Pugo appointed Militia Lieutenant General Ivan Shilov to be the first deputy minister of the interior of the USSR and acting head of the ministry's main department for Moscow and Moscow region, says an announcement issued today by the USSR Interior Ministry's press service.

The two ministers' orders succeeding one another apparently mark the beginning of a new spiral of the conflict between the authorities of the Union and the largest republic following the end of the Congress of Russia's People's Deputies on Friday. The congress consolidated the positions of Russian parliament leader Boris Yeltsin.

On the eve of the congress, President Mikhail Gorbachev had issued a decree subordinating the capital's militia directly to the centre by creating the USSR Interior Ministry's Main Department for Moscow and Moscow region.

This gave rise to a negative reaction among participants in the congress who regarded it as "running counter to the constitutions of the USSR and Russia and to the declaration of the state sovereignty of the Russian Federation." As a result of an ensuing discussion, deputies decided to suspend the application of the decree.

The Russian interior minister's order issued on Saturday to appoint Komissarov as the department head emphasised that this was done in pursuance of the Russian Government resolution and on the strength of a decision of the Moscow City Council of People's Deputies.

Moscow Soviet Chief To Ignore Militia Decree

PM0504140791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 91 p 1

[Item in "Have You Heard? Did You Read?" column]

[Text] Moscow Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] Chairman Yuriy Luzhkov has stated that he does not intend to recognize the president's decrees [as published] on the change in subordination of the Moscow militia; indeed, the militia itself will scarcely recognize it, since it is in close contact with the city authorities.

Deputies Protest Militia Subordination to Center

Hunger-Strikers Appeal to Popov

LD0704203991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Text] We have received a telegram by the Board of the Memorial Society addressed to Gavriil Popov. I will cite it in full:

The hunger strike announced by 18 deputies of the Moscow Soviet, now in its third week, has brought some of them to the edge of death and is threatening the lives of the others. The people's deputies demand that the Moscow militia, in accordance with the Constitution, is subordinate to the Moscow Soviet and is not turned into an obedient weapon in the hands of the president. In the interests of their voters, the people's deputies have undertaken an extreme form of protest. A memorial plenum appeals to all those on whom a way out of the deadlock depends: Are you aware that twelve human lives are on your consciences and your consciences alone? The constitutional ways of solving the problem are well known to you. Now, it is no longer days but hours that count.

That was a telegram by the Board of the Memorial Society to Gavriil Popov. Copies of it were also sent to Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin.

Deputies Support Komissarov Appointment

LD0704163191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Text] Today, we received the following statement:

In response to the report from the USSR Interior Ministry a group of hunger-striking deputies of the Moscow Soviet wish to state, I quote, the Union structures are violating the acting Union and republican legislation again, for example, paragraph 91 of the USSR Constitution, which states that the soviets of the people's deputies establish executive and administrative bodies. The main internal affairs directorate of the Moscow City Executive Committee is such a body. Paragraph 87 of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Constitution repeats this clause of the Union law and adds that the soviets elect, appoint or confirm the heads of such bodies. The decision adopted by the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies on the division of the functions of directorates and organizations on the territory of RSFSR stipulates that the RSFSR Interior Minister is subordinate only to the RSFSR Council of Ministers and cooperates with the USSR Interior Minister. The main thing is a decision taken by the Third Congress of the RSFSR People's Deputies which suspends the USSR president's decree on the creation of a main directorate of the USSR Interior Ministry for Moscow and Moscow Oblast.

The group of hunger-striking deputies of the Moscow Soviet continue to demand the implementation of the RSFSR Constitution and the republican laws, in accordance with which General Komissarov should be presented to the men of the Moscow militia tomorrow, Monday.

[Signed] Sedykh-Bondarenko, Yuriy Petrovich, chairman of the regular commission for legality, law and order and the protection of citizens of the Moscow Soviet, with 16 more signatures.

Union, Republic Foreign Ministers Meet 5 Apr

LD0604084691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2000 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 5 Apr (TASS)—USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh joined a Council of Foreign Ministers of the USSR and the Union republics meeting in Moscow today.

During the course of a frank and businesslike conversation, the participants in the meeting exchanged views on a broad range of questions of general interest.

There was detailed discussion of practical aspects of the preparations for the 46th session of the UN General Assembly and for the Moscow meeting of the Conference on the Human Dimension of the CSCE. USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy delivered a report on this subject. Tajikistan Foreign Minister L.K. Kayumov delivered a report on the Muslim factor in Soviet foreign policy.

Much attention was paid to improving the work of the council as an important mechanism for cooperation between the foreign policy departments of the republics and the Union. This has a positive influence, council participants noted, on the processes of forming and renewing the federation. The meeting confirmed the serious interest in a constant and constructive quest for mutually acceptable solutions to all the questions which arise.

It was noted that in the present circumstances it is especially important to maintain coordination of the general directions of foreign policy of the Union while taking maximum account of and giving maximum respect to each of the Union republics.

Taking part in the work of the council were: A.A. Salamov (Azerbaijan), A.Ye. Yegiazaryan (Armenia), P.K. Kravchenko (Belorussia), G.I. Khonelidze (Georgia), A.Kh. Arystanbekov (Kazakhstan), M.S. Imanaliyev (Kyrgyzstan), Ya. Peters (Latvia), N.A. Tsyu (Moldova), A.V. Kozyrev (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic), L.K. Kayumov (Tajikistan), A.O. Kuliyev (Turkmenia), S.A. Azimov (Uzbekistan), A.M. Zlenko (Ukraine), Yu. Kakhn (Estonia).

Yakovlev Interviewed on Yeltsin's New Powers

PM0804112191 Paris LIBERATION in French 5 Apr 91 p 6

[Interview with Gorbachev adviser Aleksandr Yakovlev by Alexandre Adler and Pierre Haski in Paris—date not given]

[Text] [LIBERATION] How do you react to Boris Yeltsin's increased powers, do you think it could be a positive development?

[Yakovlev] Personally, I do not welcome any departure from democratic principles, whoever is involved. Giving him full powers means that parliament is admitting its impotence and its inability to make decisions. Having said that, I admit that there are sometimes circumstances which require emergency measures. We have a situation which justifies making rapid decisions. The essential thing is to know how those powers will be used. If they are designed to engage in a ridiculous power struggle, that would be a bad thing, but if the aim is to solve specific problems, that would be natural.

[LIBERATION] You are said to advocate a coalition between the president of the Union and the presidents of the republics in what is called the center left. Could Boris Yeltsin's increased powers encourage that compromise?

[Yakovlev] It is difficult to say. I think that civic national accord is vital whatever happens, irrespective of the powers which a particular leader has. I am also sure that we need accord among all the political forces. The country is in such a state that we can no longer afford disputes, especially on minor questions. In my country I often say: "Let us tackle economic stabilization now and our quarrels will come later."

[LIBERATION] What do you think is the main obstacle to a rapprochement between Gorbachev and Yeltsin?

[Yakovlev] This raises many questions. First, there is the fact that the Russian parliament has adopted several laws which conflict with federal laws. There is also the fact that the Union president must take account of the view of all the republican presidents. He cannot only consult with the Russian president, which the latter is demanding. The third factor is the irritation and anger which has built up over the past three years. I would add that in this matter the Russian Communist Party leaders could play a positive role but, unfortunately, they are not doing so.

[LIBERATION] When you listen to some prominent members of the Russian Government, you feel that there are few objective differences. Are the main obstacles not between the two men?

[Yakovlev] I do not think so, and I do not think that these two men should be blamed for everything. I think that it is the Union's previous government which largely contributed to the growing confrontation between the Union and Russia. That government always refused to recognize that Russia could have its own government. It is now very important that Russia should deal with the matters over which it has authority, and that the central government should deal with its own affairs without interfering with the republics' areas of authority. But this is very difficult because we all want to interfere in other people's business.

[LIBERATION] What are these areas of authority? Should Russia give up its foreign ministry and give up issuing money?

[Yakovlev] The central government should keep responsibility for defense, security, transportation, energy, fundamental scientific research, and social programs coordinated at Union level. The rest is the republics' responsibility. But the areas I have listed must be freely handed over to the center by the republics. With regard to currency, Russia has never seriously raised that question, any more than it has the question of its own army. With regard to foreign affairs, each republic has, but it is the Union which must keep responsibility for international negotiations [sentence as published].

[LIBERATION] Is the growth of nationalism now a particularly worrying threat?

[Yakovlev] It is indeed a serious threat and I am afraid that it will exist for some time yet. But my impression is that we will gradually witness an awareness that nationalism leads nowhere. Nationalism only arouses hatred.

Ryzhkov Speaks Out on Gorbachev, Yeltsin

LD0704085491 London THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH in English 7 Apr 91 p 17

[Interview with Nikolay Ryzhkov, former USSR prime minister, by Andrey Orlov, former TASS political commentator: "How I Was Betrayed by Gorbachev; Kremlin Power Games: At Last The Sacked Soviet Prime Minister Speaks Out"]

[Text] The once sleek and good-looking Mr Nikolay Ryzhkov is a shadow of his former self. The one-time apparatchik, so at ease at the heart of Soviet power, now sits haggard and forgotten in his retirement dacha southwest of Moscow. The two-storey wooden building in pleasant woodlands, like its neighbours in the exclusive Ilyinskoe region, is surrounded by a high fence with a long driveway bounded by the no-entry signs that mark a high-ranking official's residence.

Outside the house, an official driver polishes the black limousine. Both are perks for life, but Ryzhkov knows his daily drives to the Kremlin are over.

The secrecy that surrounds Soviet politics inevitably gives credence to gossip and rumours, and people were very willing to believe reports that Ryzhkov's heart attack was nothing more than a ruse to save him from the humiliation of being sacked. But two months in hospital have left very real marks. He is frail and looks older than his 61 years.

But the bitterness in his voice when he recalls the days that preceded the attack reveals that the mental scars are far deeper. He makes no secret of the fact that he feels he was betrayed by Gorbachev, cast aside in what he calls a desperate bid by the latter to stay in power. One day in particular stands out, November 17, when Gorbachev rang him up and calmly informed him that he had decided to replace the government, the Council of Ministers, with a new administration directly under the President. The move flew in the face of repeated assurances from Gorbachev that the government would stay in place, at least for the time being. Ryzhkov's protests were swept aside by Gorbachev, who told him he had thought it over and that it was "what the people wanted".

But Ryzhkov reserves most of his ire for the man who helped unseat him, Boris Yeltsin, who has ridden to popular acclaim on the shoulders of Ryzhkov's humiliation.

"Boris Yeltsin is an awesome man. If, God forbid, he ever succeeds in gaining supreme power, he will stop at nothing. There will be gallows in the streets." He blames himself and other members of the leadership for Yeltsin's success, which he believes stems from the official campaign to discredit him after his dismissal as Moscow party chief in late 1987. "He is our own creation. We should have ignored him; instead we set up a show trial—and it won him six million votes at the elections."

Unlike Yeltsin, Gorbachev did not go to the people, relying instead on the 4,500 deputies to the Soviet parliament to elect him formally as President, just as he had used the Communist Party's quota of reserved seats to get into parliament to start with—as Ryzhkov himself had done. Now Ryzhkov concedes that this was probably a mistake. Gorbachev, he says, would feel much more secure with a popular vote behind him.

As for Ryzhkov's attitude to Gorbachev himself, he believes there is no viable alternative. But the old party loyalty has broken down: "With all due respect, he is ruled by his impulses. He gets carried away. When he sees something he likes, he rushes to grab it."

The most glaring example of this, Ryzhkov feels, came in the manner of his own treatment. The summer of 1990 had been bad for his government. Charged with setting up an economic reform programme, he and his cabinet colleagues suddenly found the ground swept away from them by the work of an independent think-tank under the influential radical economist, Stanislav Shatalin.

Ryzhkov says Yeltsin, the champion of Shatalin's 500-day plan, did not even bother to read it. Ryzhkov is sure that his own, more cautious approach to economic reform was more soundly based than the 500-day plan, which he characterises as "populist and unfeasible".

"Margaret Thatcher simply laughed when we discussed it," he recalls. "She pointed out that it took her government 11 years to privatise just a tiny portion of what Soviet radicals intended to privatise within the first 100 days."

Boris Yeltsin demanded Ryzhkov's resignation as necessary for the success of economic reform. The conservative camp was in ruins after the congress and Gorbachev decided an alliance with Yeltsin would be in his best interests.

"Who are Gorbachev's advisers today? I don't see them, and that worries me. In the past, he was always surrounded by strikingly different personalities - but they were all first-calibre politicians and thinkers. We always told him the truth, no matter how bitter it was. Yes, we had white-hot arguments with each other, because none of us would yield his own position, - but it helped Gorbachev. He weighed up differing views and found useful compromises. They have all gone now—Medvedev, Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, even Ligachev, with whom I've often clashed. And now it's my turn, and I don't know who he can count on tomorrow.

"Gorbachev is now surrounded by pure executives, not thinkers. I don't see anyone capable of advising him, let alone correcting him. And that is a very dangerous situation indeed."

Gorbachev, says Ryzhkov, did not gain anything from his brief alliance with Yeltsin, apart from much-needed breathing space. For Yeltsin, on the other hand, it was a breakthrough to the very top level of political life, putting him on a par with Gorbachev himself.

"My feeling at that time was not to trust Yeltsin, who I know all too well both from our common work in the Urals and in Moscow as well. He is neither a democrat, nor is he progressive."

Ryzhkov rejects the notion that Gorbachev, when he finally abandoned the 500-day programme, was saving the Ryzhkov government. "He was saving himself," he says. "Perhaps he knew that after the government had gone it would have been his own turn next."

Ryzhkov is sharply critical of the first steps taken by his successor as Prime Minister, Valentin Pavlov, in particular the 50- and 100-rouble note exchange and his allegations of a conspiracy by Western bankers to overthrow the Soviet government.

"I think it was a just a rather clumsy ideological explanation of his monetary reform, and it is bound to alienate the West. And under the present conditions the USSR simply cannot afford to do that.

"Things are quite bad enough as they are. Three years ago we were borrowing up to 20 billion roubles in hard currency per year, but now many Western banks don't want to lend us money—mainly because of political instability in the country. And the crunch in hard currency and supply of credits is immediately felt in different sectors of the Soviet economy, first and foremost in industry. And to intimidate the banks in such conditions—it's lunacy!"

Ryzhkov sees the roots of the current catastrophic state of Soviet economy in two overlapping circumstances: political blunders and social instability. "When we set out we were expecting an entirely different political situation to develop." He blames an "obsession with ideology" for some of the political blunders. "Ideology and politics in the Soviet Union have always taken priority over economic considerations, and it is this pattern that we are bound to change if we are serious about reforms." One of the most glaring instances was the Politburo's refusal to allow long overdue price reform as early as 1988. "If we had had the correct price system then, the situation today would be completely different."

But he defends his government's record and sets a note of optimism for the future. "We were the pioneers. The changes in the economic environment and in people's minds are much more fundamental than anything we could have imagined when we started in 1985. My government laid the foundations of the new market environment. But it might take generations to complete the process.

"It's like a battle: the first wave of assault troops is wiped out, the second is wounded and the third gets the medals. We were the first line, and only future generations will be able to judge us on our merits."

Pavlov, Yeltsin Attend Easter Service

LD0704091191 Moscow TASS in English 0510 GMT 7 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Anna Grigoroyeva and Aleksandres Budris]

[Excerpt] Moscow April 3 TASS—At midnight the chimes of bells in all orthodox churches signalled the beginning of the celebration of Easter—the resurrection of Christ.

The Orthodox Church celebrates Easter on April 7. This year is notable for the fact that Easter coincides with yet another holiday, one of twelve major Christian feasts—the annunciation of the most holy mother of God.

An Easter divine service was officiated in the main temple of the Moscow patriarchate—the Cathedral of the Epiphany—by the primate of the Russian Orthodox Church, Patriarch Aleksey II of Moscow and All Russia. He was assisted by Bishop Arseni of Istra and by the cathedral clergy.

Together with parishioners and other Muscovites, Valentin Pavlov, USSR prime minster, Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, representatives of diplomatic corps and members of their families and foreign guests were in the resplendent cathedral richly decorated with garlands of flowers. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Makes Ministerial Appointments

LD0504213291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today, USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev issued decrees on the appointments of Comrade Belousov as minister of the USSR defense industry; Comrade Panyukov as minister of USSR civil aviation; Comrade Pugin as minister of USSR automotive and agricultural machine-building; and Comrade Shishkin as minister of USSR general machine-building.

Paulman Appointed USSR Labor Minister

PM0404090391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 91 Second Edition p 2

[USSR President M. Gorbachev 26 March 1991 decree appointing V.F. Paulman USSR minister of labor and social questions]

[Text] Comrade Valeriya Fedorovich Paulman is appointed USSR minister of labor and social questions.

[Signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev

Moscow, the Kremlin

26 March 1991.

Constitutional Committee Examines Legislation

LD0504184591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] A news conference in Moscow today summed up the results of the latest session of the USSR Constitutional Supervision Committee. The committee's chairman, Sergey Sergeyevich Alekseyev, stressed that in the difficult times in which we live the law, designed to assert the principles of civic peace and accord, represents a stabilizing factor in society. At its present session the committee advanced conclusions about legal acts concerning the use of military servicemen for maintaining public order. Examiniation of a corresponding decree from the USSR president was concluded, because of the passing of a Law on the Soviet Militia. Cognizance was taken of a statement from the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet that the fifth session will examine issues concerning the overall outline for military reform and the associated draft legislation.

The USSR Constitutional Supervision Committee found articles in the service regulations requiring commanding officers to implement CPSU policies, and to resolve matters connected with garrison services and holding joint events in consultation with local party bodies, to be at variance with Articles 6 and 7 of the USSR Constitution, and suspended their effect until such time as the discrepancy is eliminated.

The Constitutional Supervision Committee examined a number of other most important pieces of legislation concerning citizens' rights. All these decisions will be published. The committee took the initiative for legislation to deal with a number of questions connected with safeguarding the rights of citizens, republics, and local soviets.

A resolution was adopted on regulations concerning the maintenance of public order in Moscow and Moscow Oblast. Cognizance was also taken of the question of the limits of the USSR president's legislative powers, as laid down in a USSR law of 24 September last year.

The matter of whether provisions in the USSR Law on the Soviet Militia dealing with the rights of militia bodies in combating economic crime are in line with the country's Constitution was also accepted for consideration.

Soviet Women's Committee Sends Letter to Pavlov

LD0604183191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1121 GMT 6 Apr

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr (TASS)—The Committee of Soviet Women has addressed USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov in an open letter on the price reforms and the corresponding compensation measures. In this document it is noted that women who are not working and who have devoted themselves to their families, the upbringing of children, and care of invalids and the elderly have been left without the right to compensation. This virtually leaves many without the means of existence. Collectives of unprofitable enterprises which do not have the means to make additional payments have been placed in the most difficult circumstances. Many of them have been forced to curtail social program that were envisaged. Women are being laid off at some enterprises because of the enterprises' inability to pay them and their children compensation.

The Committee of Soviet Union, in its appeal to the prime minister, insists that the government shoud look again at these problems and adopt measures for the social protection of these strata of the population. In the committee's opinion, an economic incentive by means of benefits in the tax policies of the enterprises which mostly employ women could be one way to a solution.

Kalugin Implicates KGB in 'Markov Affair'

PM0504120591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 91 p 3

[I. Kadulin report: "Evening Call to Oleg Kalugin and Leonid Shebarshin"]

[Text] Citing former General O. Kalugin, Radio Liberty reported a few days ago on the USSR KGB's involvement in the so-called "Bulgarian affair of Markov." The USSR KGB Public Relations Center in turn declared that Kalugin's allegations are a crude fabrication.

"There was absolutely no question of the Bulgarian special services' turning to the USSR KGB in this 'affair.' The KGB reserves the right to apply to the appropriate Soviet organs on the question of Kalugin's liability for slander," it was reported through TASS channels.

Since the details of the "affair" are not so widely known, we asked Oleg Kalugin to explain the matter.

"What is meant," he said, "is the killing of the prominent Bulgarian political emigre and writer Georgi Markov, perpetrated by the Bulgarian special services in London in 1978.

"I was working in intelligence at the time, and I recall a conference on operational questions being held one day in the office of Andropov, who was chairman of the USSR KGB at that time. It was attended by Andropov, Kryuchkov (chief of the KGB First Main Directorate, i.e. intelligence, at that time), his first deputy Vice Admiral Usatov, and myself. It was then that this information was produced: 'Our Bulgarian colleagues are asking for help to remove Markov.' After a long pause Andropov finally said: 'I am against political killings.' But the decision was still adopted.

"The Bulgarians did not have the necessary equipment, whereas Special Laboratory No. 12 had been operating at the KGB ever since Stalin's times. It was this that produced a poison which dissolves in the organism immediately on penetration, a device disguised as an umbrella which fires special bullets at close range...

"The reason why Markov was killed is well known: For a long time he had been close to Zhivkov's family, and he knew a great deal about the private life of the 'leader.' As regards my statement to Radio Liberty and to you, I am prepared to testify before any court."

In addition, we telephoned Lieutenant General Leonid Shebarshin, chief of the USSR KGB First Main Directorate (Intelligence), who told us the following:

"Following the initial report about the KGB's supposed involvement in the 'Markov affair' in 1978, the KGB First Main Directorate and I myself made a thorough study of this question. We did not discover any participants, witnesses, or archive documents in this regard. It is an ill-intentioned fabrication."

PRAVDA Defends Nishanov From Attack in Press

PM0304145591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Apr 91 Second Edition p 3

[Correspondent V. Artemenko report under the "Local Press Sensation" rubric: "The Louder You Lie..."]

[Text] Tashkent—The republic newspaper MOLODEZH UZBEKISTANA published on its front page a long open letter entitled "Under the Cover of Loud Promises." It was addressed to R. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet chamber of the Soviet of Nationalities. Its author was I. Khushev, chief editor of the journals KHAYET VA IKTISOD and ZHIZN I EKONOMIKA [Life and Economics].

The actual appearance of such a letter in the time of glasnost and pluralism is a commonplace, normal occurrence. But the abusive, unrestrained tone of the letter is surprising and in his portrayal of R. Nishanov's life and activity the author is far from the truth.

On reading the letter you come to the unambiguous conclusion that Nishanov is simply an idler. Yet Rafik Nishanov is constantly in the view of millions of Soviet people. We see him at sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and he constantly travels abroad on parliamentary business and visits trouble spots in the Soviet Union. But does the chairman of the chamber really have so little work outside what can be read about in official press reports and seen on television? I spoke with Rafik Nishanov the other day and saw for myself that he has a great deal of work. Are the voters of Fergana Oblast, where he is a deputy, really against their elected representative discharging responsible parliamentary business for the good of the whole Soviet people?

Khushev appeals several times to the people, who are apparently dissatisfied at Nishanov's activity as a deputy. But where is the voice of the people of Fergana? Why does the author not cite a single specific opinion in his letter? In such a case why would the voters themselves not write an open letter to the newspapers? But perhaps they, these highly dissatisfied people, do not exist?

In portraying Nishanov's long life in his letter Khushev charges him at every step with dishonesty, unobjectivity, and incompetence. And everywhere, without a twinge of conscience, he lies.

For example, readers are offered with relish the following stunning fact: "Why does your family continue to 'live cozily' in a two-story mansion with several dozen rooms?.." After reading this, I visited the house in question. No, Nishanov's family has been living in **half** the two-story house for around 13 years now and occupies in all...four rooms.

Khushev stood up for Sh. Rashidov in his letter. He berated Nishanov for exposing the Rashidov era while he himself has acted "like Rashidov at his worst." He also contended: Was Sharaf Rashidovich really harsh if he sent Rafik Nishanovich "peacefully" off to Maritime Kray? No, it turns out that he did him a favor.

And, finally, there is the tone of the letter. The editor of two magazines and a member of the Tashkent Obkom [oblast party committee] addresses his compatriot, who is, incidentally, twice his age, in the following terms: "I feel ashamed looking at you during sessions of the country's Supreme Soviet—is this a tribune or a bland 'MC'"... And it gets even harsher as it goes on: "You remain to this day what you always were, a living embodiment of the 'cadre-cum-functionary.'" It turns out that Khushev too has a hard time standing up..."for Nishanov": "It is not easy, believe me...answering for your actions. Journalists have to answer for what they write and are no longer able to invoke your gracious favor..."

The letter writer draws the following categorical and peremptory conclusion: "Excuse me, but creating the semblance of feverish activity while not lifting a finger won't get the work done!.. Is it not better in such a situation to be honest and give the people back their trust. Particularly as this trust has long failed to manifest itself in any way..."

So there we have it—neither more nor less. Khushev has decided everything on behalf of the people and the Supreme Soviet himself. Has the editor not bitten off more than he can chew?

Leading Officials Attend Perestroyka Conference

LD0604093791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0700 GMT 6 Apr 91

[Text] A conference entitled Perestroyka in the USSR: Yesterday, today and tomorrow is planned to be held on 20-21 April. The NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA even names those who are planning to take part in this conference. They are Comrades Bakatin, Ligachev, Osipyan, Petrakov, Popov, Khasbulatov, Yavlinskiy, and Yakovlev. Intvitations, according to the report, were also sent to Prime Minister Pavlov, Silayev, and Shevardnadze. I hope you all know these names.

The main aim of this basically roundtable is to try to organize in our country a civilized dialogue between people holding different opinions, despite the dramatic character of the processes which are taking shape in the USSR. It is expected that the work of the conference will be covered in detail by our and foreign mass media. I would like to note that in order to be present at the conference, foreign journalists will have to pay approximately $500 each. But in order to be present at such a unique meeting, our foreign colleagues are prepared to pay considerably more. After all, their main aim is to receive unique information.

International Perestroyka Group Registered

91UF0593A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Apr 91 Union Edition p 5

[Report on interview with Academician Vladimir Lisichkin, president of MAPP and general director of the scientific production association Prognostika, by G. Charodeyev; place and date not given: "Perestroyka Requires Support"]

[Text] **A few days ago the USSR Ministry of Justice announced the registration of the International Association in Support of Perestroyka (MAPP), which has already been functioning for a year as an international organization with its headquarters in Geneva.**

Academician Vladimir Lisichkin, president of MAPP and general director of the scientific production association Prognostika, talks with a correspondent of IZVESTIYA about the first steps of MAPP.

"We proceed from the fact that today it is necessary to form a whole complex of mutually connected scientific and high-technology industries in the country's national economy that will enjoy favored status. On the basis of this complex it will be possible to improve the entire economy of the country and again make it centralized, strong, and responsive to the level of the modern world and to the demands of requirements and aspirations in the 21st century.

"We were guided by precisely these ideas when we decided to enter into foreign economic ties with a whole series of large partners from the United States, Switzerland, and other countries. And in the process we understood that the upcoming problems of the development of partnership relations with foreign companies would be accompanied by major difficulties in connection with the introduction of a new economic mechanism and an abrupt broadening of the limits on independence of associations and enterprises.

"There is no sin in turning to Western countries for aid. We are not doing it with the outstretched hand of a supplicant but in accordance with principles of partnership, equality, and mutual profit. The Soviet Union has something to offer the West in terms of raw materials, timber, and metal. It has unique methods, its own 'know-how,' and technology which even the largest Japanese development companies can envy.

"The most important goal of the international association is also the establishment of fruitful, long-term, and mutually profitable contacts between Soviet and foreign businessmen, companies, scientific circles, and development companies, and propagation of the ideas of perestroyka. Within the framework of MAPP we are presently establishing broad business contacts with leading designers and producers of the world's most advanced personal computers, looking for opportunities to provide a speedy supply of personal computers of the future to sectors, and speeding up development of the newest technical computing equipment, which can fill the gap in our country's information sciences."

Implications of Rally's Suppression Viewed

PM0404135491 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

["Political Diary" article by E. Gonzalyez: "After the Rally"]

[Text] The present government, from the outset, discovered a facility to cause incredulity and provoke the question: "Why?" Money exchange—why? Sales tax on the eve of a price hike—why? Confrontation with the miners—why? And, finally, there is the banning of the Moscow rally.

The whole buildup to the battle for Manezhnaya Square was plain to see from the editorial office's windows. The defense in depth made up of trucks, the water cannons and tankers hidden in the corners of Tverskaya Street, the soldiers and militia in flak jackets and carrying shields, the ambulances. Why? Thousands of people went up to the defenders of Manezhnaya Square in the evening to find this out.

They were calm, sober, ordinary people. They gathered to express their attitude toward the Russian congress, a presidency in the republic, the positions of Yeltsin, Silayev, and their opponents. They were not allowed into the center, and they turned into Mayakovskiy Square, which, for some reason, there had been no attempt to defend. And some people spoke out right here on Pushkin Square. What did it all mean? Can we at least find some logical explanation for the "little enclosure" they fenced off during these days?

How much effort was expended, how many of our own laws were broken, how many urgent reorganizations were carried out—and for what purpose? Surely this was not solely in order to avoid hearing and knowing our fellow citizens' opinions on this or that matter?

It's amazing! All the more so, as only recently the greatest interest was shown in these very citizens, and moreover on a countrywide scale. And these very troops and this very militia did everything in their power to ensure that those wishing to participate in the referendum could do so, even in those places where it was not being conducted at all. And here too they spent money, broke laws, and resorted to all kinds of ruses.

Think what you like, but I can only put forward one explanation: In both cases the people's opinion was known in advance. On the matter of preserving the Union it was pleasing to hear the word "yes!" And, no doubt, useful. What they gathered to discuss at the Moscow rally was, clearly, disagreeable to hear.

Perhaps this is the saddest thing. What are the ideas which guide us in the higher echelons of power? Selfish whims? And, at the end of the day, to what purpose do we use the might of state structures, parliament, the government, the organs of security and protection of order, and the Army? To protect certain people from unpleasant feelings?

Who's arguing, it is unpleasant when 500,000 fellow citizens express their disapproval. And naturally it seems unjust. But surely nothing in life will change if this time they succeed in hushing up what everybody knows, with the help of the militia and soldiers? But of course something will change. Only not for the better.

It is doubtless possible to pretend that the people and the authorities are united not only on the question of the state, but on all questions across the board. And to close your eyes to the strikes, protests, demonstrations, growing apathy, and falling labor productivity. This also is a way out! But even the measures taken before the rally are not enough in themselves for this. It is necessary in addition to at least give the people a lashing, and it would be better to swap them for another people—less (or more?) quick on the uptake, similar to our own, only as they were yesterday.

Incidentally, yesterday confirms that everything is possible—the people have been castigated and swapped before now. And often for no more serious reason than the desire not to hear what they think. Only "today" differs from "yesterday" in that, for the moment, the unanswered question of what we are going to eat tomorrow inexorably lurks behind all our decisions, acts, wishes, and pleasant and unpleasant sensations.

We understand everything nowadays. Even that there is a power struggle in progress. Or to be more precise, a struggle to maintain power. We understand that each rally, each word pronounced in a square or from a tribune is regarded only as the next in a series of blows in this struggle. But it is hard to see: What on earth will the victor gain? Power, which, it is commonly admitted, has been paralyzed? Power, but without sturgeon canapes in the presidium's lounge?

You only have to imagine this power, and all desire to fight falls away completely. In 1917 there was some sense in taking power—as it transpired, you can get high on it for 70 years. But what are they hoping for today? After all, the people who are subject to the authorities and create material wealth are those selfsame people whose way to the town's center was blocked by trucks.

Okay then, they took power into their own hands in Manezhnaya Square yesterday. But what is happening in the plant workshops, the scientific research institutes, the higher education establishments? Why does no one remember that as before the angle of incidence is equal to the angle of reflection, and that each action has an opposite reaction? On the contrary, it has become obvious that again preference is being shown to violence in relations. Now the head of government has changed, we have a multitude of examples of unceremonious, even cynical intrusions into citizens' lives. There are so many of them that you cannot help wondering: Maybe a disregard for people, who only recently were being called the "human factor," is being intentionally displayed here? Let's flex our muscles like body builders. Just take a look at us: We can do this, we can do that. And in general, what we decide, we shall do.

Well, so everybody saw for themselves on 28 March that force really does exist. And it makes an impression. But, alas, it does not rid us of the question: What are we going to eat tomorrow? Surely it is clear now that it was many years of violence that brought the country to its present state. Some people are inclined to call it a crisis. But a crisis is a temporary phenomenon. And our crisis will not go away of its own accord, and will only end when the violence ends—and not before. You see, even according to a Marxist interpretation of history, the slave-owning system and later the feudal system collapsed for this reason.

I vaguely remember how in school we were told about the Byzantine state. It flourished for a long time, situated as it was at the crossroads of the trade routes, but later on it fell into decline and ceased to exist. I simply refused to comprehend it: How could this whole state fall into decline? They lived a life of pleasure, and suddenly, what do you know—decline. What, you might ask, did they lack?

Now that a state that only yesterday was considered a great power has fallen into decline before our very eyes, we begin to understand what is lacking in such cases. Relations in society that preclude any form of violence against law-abiding citizens—be it judicial, economic, class-based, or bureaucratic. To say nothing of men with guns.

PRAVDA Article Provokes Martial Law Fears

PM0404152291 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 11, 17-24 Mar 91 p 4

[Vladimir Gurevich article: "PRAVDA: Martial Law Again?"]

[Text] PRAVDA devoted an article in its March 11 issue to "reminiscences" about how and why martial law was introduced in Poland in December 1981. What provoked this article? Judging by its content and conclusions, it would be better entitled "reminiscences abut the future". The newspaper of the CPSU Central Committee explains that the article was caused by "our run-of-the-mill forecasters painting hair-raising pictures of victimization, allegedly inevitable bloodshed and the return of Stalinist repression", speaking of possible developments in this country.

But there won't be any bloodshed. In Poland, says PRAVDA, martial law caused nothing of the kind. True, "unionists and leaders of organizations hoping to seize power were interned, or rather detained (or jailed, to be more precise-V.G.)". There was no other sensible way out, says Pravda, since the radicals from Solidarity advanced the dislocation of the Polish state to such an extent that the only alternative was between "the adoption of stringent measures on the part of the authorities and fratricide". But immediately after the introduction of martial law in the country and "military commissars at industrial enterprises... the internal political situation gained stability", "the economic slump was reversed", "consumer goods began to appear in shops", and "coal production increased". Of course, admits the newspaper, "martial law isn't beer and skittles", but "there are moments when procrastination can invoke giant losses".

It's good that we know the truth. Now we feel happier, both for the Poles and ourselves. We know who must be detained, how to increase coal production, fill the shops and avoid bloodshed. This is true: the victimization of dissidents, packed jails, the death of miners, murdering the clergy means "no bloodshed". Abstention from urgent reform, unwillingness to part with a power monopoly, awareness of Warsaw Treaty troops on the border and clear signals from the Kremlin-but the "radicals", "irresponsible elements" and "the West" were supposed to be responsible. Seven years of economic stagnation, endless queues, a formidable "black market", useless administered price hikes, eventual unavoidable trenchant reforms which, due to procrastination, came as a real blow, loss of popular trust and actual power by the Communist Party, fall of the government, serious industrial strikes-but "the situation was stabilized".

We have been convinced. Let's have it. True, we were speaking about the introduction of a market economy, but-since we can't do it-let's introduce martial law instead. We can always try and combine the two. A leader of Moscow communists recently explained that the Chilean option ("martial law and a market economy") is not at all bad. I like the idea. Besides, there was virtually no "bloodshed": two and half thousand people killed during 17 years of the Pinochet regime seems peanuts to a country which knew such human losses in the space of one day! However, there's one predicament here: civil rights were curbed in Chile, but free enterprise was given full rein and private property ownership thrived. But we, in the Soviet Union, harbour certain doubts concerning the second part of that programme. Therefore it is only too logical to embark on the part we have no doubts about.

Soyuz Deputies Launch 'Hard-Hitting' Paper

PM0504141191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Apr 91 First Edition p 3

["Direct Line" report by unnamed correspondent: "'Soyuz' Has its own Newspaper"]

[Text] Moscow—The first number of the weekly POLITIKA [POLITICS], founded by the deputies' group "Soyuz," has come out.

Chief editor Aleksandr Fomenko characterized his paper in a paragraph entitled "How We Will Style POLITIKA" in the following manner: "An unorthodox and hard-hitting analysis of countrywide and worldwide events—plus a story from abroad which has only just been translated; "hot" news from the Kremlin hill—and a review of what's new in cultural life..." The weekly's first issue entirely lives up to this claim. It carries interviews with Yuriy Blokhin, leader of the "Soyuz" deputies' group, and Jack Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR. Igor Shafarevich answers the question "What is patriotism?"

In POLITIKA you will also find things still unknown to the reader at large. "A Night in Vilnius" is actually the first report by the USSR Prosecutor's Office on the progress of the official investigation into the events of 13 January.

Economic

Gorbachev Meets With Coal Industry Leaders

LD0504210991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Apr 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev met with leaders of the coal enterprises of the Kuznetsk Basin and Vorkuta today. They discussed questions of getting colliery work going, as well as transfers to new forms of management and administration and the strengthening of the commitment of the collectives to the results of their labor. The USSR president instructed the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry to prepare full proposals on these matters within a month, taking into account the views of leaders of enterprises and miners. Participating in the meeting were USSR Prime Minister Pavlov; Gavrilov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic; and Shchadov, USSR coal industry minister.

Over 40 Kuzbass Mines Remain on Strike

LD0604174291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 6 Apr 91

[Text] Kuzbass miners have boycotted talks with the country's prime minister, and more than 40 mines have failed to resume work. The Bolshevik pit miners have called upon their colleagues to reject the benefits envisaged after meeting with Prime Minister Pavlov because they may lead to a split in the workers' movement. A new day has already begun in Kuzbass, and all-union radio has broadcast a report on yesterday's meeting between USSR President Gorbachev and the representatives of the Kuzbass and Vorkuta coal industry. By this time, the situation in the miners' collectives is more complicated than ever before. Six open cast mines stopped work, besides 45 mines. Considering other enterprises, one might say that the entire Kuznetsk coal field continues to strike and that it is operating only at half its capacity.

Kuzbass miners now owe 800,000 tonnes of fuel to customers since the beginning of April.

Three More Mines Join Strike

PM0704183791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent S. Vtorushin under the rubric "After the Talks": "Kuzbass"]

[Text] As of 7 April a three more mines—"Zapadnaya," "Kiselevskaya," and "Zyryanovskaya"—as well as the Prokopyevsk Mine-Sinking Administration had stopped work in the Kuzbass.

Unless emergency measures are taken to resume the mines' work, many byproduct coke enterprises may stop work within the next few days.

The price hike has occasioned a new wave of strike sentiments.

Kuzbass Strikers Up by One-Third

PM0704184191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[From a roundup of IZVESTIYA, TASS, REUTER, UPI, and POSTFACTUM reports: "Kuzbass: The Strike Spreads"]

[Text] Kuzbass miners have responded to the miners' representatives' talks in the Kremlin by extending the political strike. In recent days the number of strikers has increased by approximately one-third. According to the information of the strike committees council, 91 labor collectives in the oblast are now participating in the strike, including 64 mines and six open-cut pits which are fully or partially on strike. As before, some mines are working (they must not stop because of geological mining conditions), but not dispatching coal. In accordance with the decisions of city strike committees, 12 enterprises are extracting and dispatching coal for power stations, heating plants, and metallurgical enterprises.

The strike committees council has appealed to the collectives of all Russian enterprises under Union jurisdiction to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, reports IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Kostyukovskiy.

Strike Suspended in Inta, Continues in Vorkuta

LD0604181691 Moscow TASS in English 1749 GMT 6 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Makarov from Inta, Komi]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—At their conference today, representatives of workers' collectives at coal industry enterprises in the city of Inta, the Pechora coalfield, made a decision to suspend the strike.

The decision was made after representatives of the country's miners met President Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov in Moscow on April 2-3.

It was recognised as inexpedient to carry on the labour action considering the economic and social situation that has arisen in the country. Pit workers themselves are sustaining rapidly increasing losses.

In addition, miners think that the government is unable today to do more than it promised at the meeting in Moscow, concerning their economic demands. Workers decided to outpace plans for the production and unloading of coal to offset losses sustained during the stoppage and to enable customers to rectify the situation.

The Intinskaya pit has not yet resumed operation. Its workers put to the fore political demands.

Pit workers in Vorkuta have shown no signs of compromise. Miners from 11 out of 13 pits continue the walkout.

TASS reports from Kemerovo that by the time radio broadcast a report about the meeting of the country's leaders with miners, the situation in miners' collectives had complicated as never before. Workers at six coal faces downed tools to join the stoppage by 45 mines.

The Kuznetsk coalfield is operating only 50 per cent of its capacity. Kuzbass miners have borrowed 800,000 tonnes of fuel from customers since the beginning of April and over three million tonnes since the start of the labour action on March 4.

Miners at the Bolshevik pit called upon their counterparts not to accept privileges offered to them after the meeting with Pavlov. They think this may bring about a split in the working class.

Miners' strike dealt a heavy blow to Kemerovo railmen. Customers will receive today only half of 6,000 cars with coal. Kuzbass transport workers have never before seen such low transportation rates.

Donbass Miners Drawn Into 'Political Struggle'

PM0704183591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

["After the Talks" report by correspondent B. Glotov: "Donbass"]

[Text] According to the "Donetskugol" Association's data, 18 mines and several mine construction administrations were on strike in the oblast 6 April. This was several enterprises fewer than before.

The miners have not yet had time to "digest" what the government has proposed. On returning from Moscow the strike committee members at once declared that the miners' demands had been satisfied in full only as regards pension provision. The government's other proposals were unacceptable.

The results of the talks in the Kremlin were discussed in a roughly similar spirit at a session of representatives of the strike committees of the oblast's coal associations and enterprises held 5 April. A new wave of appeals to extend the strike and to struggle until a "victorious end" was raised there.

To all appearances, the miners are increasingly being drawn into a political struggle.

Thus teams of people wishing to go to Kiev to picket the work of the republic Supreme Court session are now being formed at the oblast's mines.

At whose expense will the miners travel? For they themselves have now been sitting for more than a month without pay. It has been learned that the Ukrainian Republican Party is allocating such funds. Previously the miners had virtually made no contacts with such groups. Now, as we see, the situation is changing.

Mining Situation 'More Complicated' Than Before

LD0704004791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2123 GMT 6 Apr 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] In keeping with a decision to suspend the strike adopted at the town-wide conference of representatives of the labor collectives of the Inta mining enterprises, four out of five mines in the Inta concern are carrying on with the extraction of fuel.

The Kuzbass miners have boycotted the talks with Pavlov, the country's prime minister. More than 40 have failed to resume work.

The situation in the mining collectives has become more complicated than ever before. The Kuznetsk coal basin is only operating at half of its capacity.

[Correspondent G. Kondaurov] The decisions adopted in Moscow at the meeting of the miners' collectives and the country's government have not caused the strike in the Donbass to be suspended. Today a fourth of the mines in the Ukraine are on strike and several mine construction directorates. In the mines they believe that the miners' main problems—a rise in wages, the creation of normal working and living conditions, and ensuring a standard of living worthy of people in the extremely difficult profession—have been pushed into the background. And today when the prices have been raised and there is nothing in the shops, just as before, they have become even more acute than a month ago when the strike started. A huge number of miners are not solvent, and there is no chance there of providing additional wages from the enterprise's funds.

At the rally today, the miners said that they do not believe in the government's chances of keeping promises and correcting the crisis situation. Scathing accusations have been addressed at the television and the press to the effect that they, as the speakers said, are not covering the strike objectively. After the talks with the government, the accent shifted in the demands that are being put forward both by the striking as well as by the operating mines of the Donbass. The strike is acquiring a political nature.

Coal-Mining Situation 'Remains Difficult'

LD0804081191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0710 GMT 8 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 8 Apr (TASS)—In spite of the fact that the Soviet leadership has agreed to satisfy the basic economic demands put forth by the miners, the situation in the USSR coal-mining regions remains difficult.

According to a report from Kemerovo (Western Siberia), nearly half of the coal-mining enterprises are still not working. This figure includes 47 mines and three opencast mines. Miners have only produced a little over a million tonnes of the three million tonnes of coal that they should have mined during the first week in April. Owing to this fall in production of coal, a significant number of the stations on the Kemerovo line are only working at a quarter of their normal capacity, and the Belovo, Osinniki, and Kapitalnaya stations have completely stopped sending coal to consumers.

The miners of the "Bolshevik" mine have called upon their colleagues not to accept the benefits which have been planned for the miners as a result of the meeting between miners' representatives and Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov. In their view, this could provoke a split in the working class.

However, the strike itself is resulting in persisting tension. Activists of various political persuasions are using it. For example, the "Democratic Union," which opposes Soviet power, is agitating for the dissolution of soviets at all levels, the seizure of mines, and the establishment of civilian opposition committees. A group of 11 Russian people's deputies from the Kuzbass and other regions of the country have protested in the local press against such calls. The deputies consider that the worsening of the socioeconomic situation in the Kuzbass is being used to attain extremist aims. They have proposed that the USSR chief prosecutor should take action against the activities of members of the "Democratic Union" who are, in essence, calling for the overthrow of the constitutional order.

At Inta (in the Pechora field in northern Russia), the decision to return to work was adopted yesterday at a general meeting of the collectives of the "Intinskaya." The other four mines of the "Intaugol" concern are already working at half-strength. The dispatching of fuel to consumers has increased several times over in the course of the last 24 hours and is now closer to the level of the plan.

There is no change to date at the mines of the polar town of Vorkuta. Miners at 11 of the 13 mines are continuing their strike. Today the striking Vorkuta miners are to decide what to do next.

Normalization Process in Mining Areas 'Difficult'

LD0704164991 Moscow TASS in English 1615 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—The latest TASS reports point to the difficult process of normalisation of the situation in several Soviet coal-mining areas where strikes began since early March.

Workers at the Intinskaya mine in the city of Inta, Pechora basin in northern Russia, today decided at their meeting to resume mining from tomorrow morning.

The other four collieries of the Intaugol concern are today operating with a swing. The delivery of coal to consumers increased there several times in the past 24 hours and is close to the plan.

Mines in the Vorkuta are still idle. Eleven of 13 mines are continuing the strike. It is expected that Vorkuta striking miners will decide tomorrow what should be done.

TASS reports form Kemerovo that the situation in the Kuznetsk coal basin remains tense. In addition to 45 mines, six opencuts joined the strike. Only 50 per cent of the basin's facilities are now operating.

Workers from the Bolshevik colliery called on their colleagues to reject economic benefits offered during the meeting between mines and Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov. In their opinion, this will split the working class.

The tense situation during the strike is used by various political forces. The Democratic Union, which is in opposition to Soviet power, is campaigning for the dissolution of councils at all levels, the seizure of mines and the establishment of civil resistance committees.

Eleven deputies to the Russian parliament from the Kuzbass basin and other areas today protested at these calls in the local press. The legislators noted that the deteriorating social and political situation in the Kuzbass basin is used to achieve extremist ends.

They suggested that the all-union prosecutor-general take measures against members of the Democratic Union, who are calling, in actual fact, for the overthrow of the constitutional system.

Miners' Reaction to Agreement Differ

LD0504213891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1900 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] The miners are discussing the agreement concluded with the government. This is what a TASS correspondent reports:

Donetsk. The reaction to the agreement that was concluded in Moscow at the talks between the leadership of the country and the representatives of the miners differs. The results of the talks should satisfy everyone, thinks Ilyushenko, general director of the Donetskugol Association. Our enterprises have at last gotten a chance not only to earn money, but also to use it by our own decision. As for the mines on strike, they have only harmed their position. It will take quite an effort to stabilize the situation at the enterprises.

There was quite a different response at the city's strike committee. According to it, the only result was a change in the legislation on pensions. Decisions made on the rest of the economic issues are considered half-baked. The strike committee has adopted a decision to continue the strike. The strike committee has been distributing leaflets in the squares of the town, with demands in them calling again for the resignation of the president of the country, and the dissolution of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

Dnepropetrovsk. The talks between the administration of Pavlogradugol Association and the representatives of the miner's collectives have come to nothing. The miners on strike have refused to return back to work. As said by Lobza, a member of the joint strike committee and a worker of the Blagodatnaya mine, the wage increase in stages as promised by the government does not satisfy the miners, because the prices have already risen three to four times. The strike continues at four out of 11 pits of the coalfield. The miners continue to put forward political demands, besides economic ones. The losses of the association, as a result of the strike, amount to about 60 million rubles as of today.

Vorkuta, Republic of Komi. Emotions are running high in the miners' collectives of the Pechora coalfield. It was stated by Kostuchenko, member of the worker's town strike committee and operator of a coal combine at the tsentralanaya pit, that the miners are not satisfied by the decisions that have been adopted at the meeting in Moscow. According to him, it is not quite clear where the money will come from for increasing wages and whether all miners will get the increases in their wages. No clear decision on a general standard tariff agreement has been taken. Besides, those on strike continue to insist on the fulfillment of political demands.

According to reports from the Intaugol concern, four out of five pits in Inta have resumed extracting coal today. The issue of whether to halt or continue the strike will be decided tomorrow, at the all-town conference of the representatives of collectives of the coal industry.

Zakamentsk, Buryatia. a decision to go on strike on Monday has a been adopted by the Kholtoson mine strike committee of the Dzhezinskiy tungsten and molybdenum combine. We express, by this, our support to the miners of Donbass, Vorkuta, and Kuzbass, said Semenov, manager of the mine. Besides this, we are not satisfied with the results of the talks that took place between the Union government and the miners. Our demands, besides political ones, include the enhancement of wages by two and a half times, and an improvement in the supply of foodstuffs, industrial goods, and tobacco products.

Resolutions on Miners' Pay Reported

PM0504153591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 91 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report: "Moving Closer"]

[Text] Several USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolutions and instructions were adopted 3 April on the basis of the results of the talks between representatives of miners' collectives and the country's government.

Resolution 138 lays down pay supplements for every tonne of mined (processed) coal (shale) on the basis that if the plans adopted by enterprises for the mining and processing of coal (shale) have been fulfilled as of 1 April 1991, the wages funds at these enterprises will be increased in comparison with the same periods of the previous year on a phased basis: by 25 percent in April-June 1991; by 50 percent in July-September 1991; by 75 percent in October-December 1991; and by 100 percent in January-March 1992.

The USSR Ministry of Finance and Union republic Councils of Ministers have been instructed to compensate USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry enterprises for any additional expenditure incurred in this regard.

The Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers has been instructed to adopt similar decisions with regard to that republic's coal industry enterprises.

It is planned to increase by 30 percent the basic wages fund for 1991 of coal machine building plants in the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry system.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers has also resolved (Resolution 137) that compensation for the rise in the prices of goods and services will be paid to workers at enterprises and construction sites in the coal (shale) industry on a differential basis as follows: 105 rubles [R] for underground work; R100 for open mining at coal (shale) open cuts; R80 for surface workers at mines and open cuts (in the technological network), for workers in the main shops at enrichment and briquet factories (installations), for workers in road and rail transport technical services, and for militarized mine rescue units serving coal and slate mines; and R60 for other workers.

The payments made to the budget by USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry enterprises and organizations will be reduced by an amount sufficient to cover compensation payments in full and, if there is a shortage of funds for this purpose, additional finance will be available from the budget.

A special resolution (No. 135) allows enterprises, institutions, and organizations located in the Far North and equivalent areas to pay once every three years the travel expenses of two members of a worker's family (spouse, children) to and from their place of vacation, together with the traveling expenses of workers themselves.

This resolution also applies to coal industry enterprises located in areas of the Buryat ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], Maritime and Khabarovsk Krays, and Amur and Chita Oblasts which are not listed as Far Northern areas or areas equivalent to Far Northern areas in USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 1029 of 10 November 1987 (in the version of the USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 12 of 3 January 1983).

Instruction No. 257R permits coal industry enterprises to sell at contractual prices on the domestic and foreign markets up to 7 percent of their power-generating coal and up to 5 percent of their coking coal out of the total amount of coal actually mined (sold).

Coal enterprises will be relieved in 1991 of the need to pay fines for failing to deliver coal under concluded contracts within the aforesaid volumes.

Another resolution—No. 136—prescribes that Paragraph 1 of the list of jobs and professions carrying the right to a pension regardless of age, provided that an employee has been engaged in such work for not less than 25 years, which was ratified by USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 1356 of 29 December 1990 (taking account of the amendments stipulated by USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 51 of 19 January 1991 and by USSR Cabinet of Ministers Resolution 88 of 11 March 1991), be extended by the addition of the following professions: underground machine operators; electric train drivers (underground); cage operators (underground); underground machine operators (underground); underground mine workers; underground electric fitters; explosives distributors; mine workers engaged in the repair of mine workings or carrying out work not covered by USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 51 of 19 January 1991; chiefs of underground sectors, along with their deputies and assistants; machine operators in underground sectors, along with their deputies and assistants; and mine foremen of underground sectors.

The USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] have been instructed by Cabinet Instruction 256R to additionally allocate the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry in 1991 material and technical resources, according to the appendix, for the construction of housing, social and cultural facilities, and municipal services in mining towns and settlements in accordance with the targets set by USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 608 of 3 August 1989.

The USSR Gossnab, the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, other USSR ministries and departments, and union republic governments are to ensure the registration [prikrepleniye] and conclusion of relevant contracts and uniform supplies of the aforesaid material and technical resources.

With a view to creating incentives for workers in leading jobs in the coal (slate) industry to considerably boost their labor productivity, the Cabinet of Ministers resolved (No. 134) to allocate a targeted sum of R15 million from the USSR Cabinet of Ministers Reserve Fund to increase in 1991 wages for workers in the leading professions as compensation for the progressive taxation of salaries of up to R1,400 a month.

The list of worker professions which will receive compensation for progressive taxation will be specified in an enterprise's collective contract.

It was deemed necessary (Instruction 255R) to conclude a wage scale agreement in the first half of 1991 for the coal (slate) industry and mine construction in 1992.

The wage scale agreement will stipulate: the inclusion in wage rates of allowances and additional payments by way of compensation; pay levels differentiated by territory with payments under rayon coefficients included in the wage rates; and the abolition of restrictions on the pay to which rayon coefficients are added.

The instruction also prescribes that the procedure by which workers' incomes are indexed and the size of such indexation be examined in the course of the conclusion of the wage scale agreement.

It was deemed necessary for the coal (slate) industry, mine construction, and industrial road and rail transport to embark in 1992 on a wide-ranging pay reform with a view to creating motives and incentives for work aimed at boosting output and improving coal quality, and with a view to doubling state minimum guaranteed wage levels (wage rates and salary scales) by correspondingly increasing settlement prices [raschetnyye tseny].

The USSR Ministry of the Economy and Forecasting, the USSR Ministry of Labor and Social Problems, the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry, and the USSR Ministry of Finance have been instructed to draw up within three months proposals on increasing the linkage between raising wages to the aforesaid levels and increasing coal output to 711 million tonnes in 1992 for the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry as a whole.

The USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, guided by Paragraph 6 of the USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution "On the Procedure for the Promulgation of the USSR Law 'On Pension Provision for Citizens in the USSR'" of 15 May 1990, has resolved:

to lay down that workers engaged in underground work, with not less than 10 years service—which entitles them, under Article 15 of the USSR law "On Pension Provision for Citizens in the USSR," to a pension regardless of age—but who have not completed the full term of service stipulated by this article, can become eligible for pension regardless of age provided they have not less than 25 years' service underground, within which:

each full year of work as breakage face worker, coal cutter using hammers, or excavation machine operator will count as one year and three months;

each full year of underground work stipulated by List No. 1 of production facilities, professions, positions, and indicators will count as nine months.

The composition of the commissions for the preparation and coordination of the wage scale agreement between the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry and unions of workers in the coal industry, and for the preparation of decisions on the basis of the results of the 2-3 April meeting with representatives of labor collectives at coal industry enterprises and organizations, was ratified.

Gorbachev Exempts Certain Goods From Sales Tax

LD0504214391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Decree issued by USSR president; from the "Vremya" newscast—read by announcer]

[Text] In connection with the introduction of new prices for food and manufactured goods and the increased sums paid by purchasers in the form of sales tax, I resolve:

1. It is recommended that the governments of the Union and the autonomous republics expand the list of consumer products and types of jobs and paid services which are exempt from sales tax.

2. The existing procedure whereby 70 percent of the total revenue accruing from sales tax is credited to the budgets of the republics and 30 percent to the budget of the Union is to be retained.

3. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of the republics are to take practical steps to implement this decree, bearing in mind that the sums levied from the population in the form of sales tax will be significantly reduced.

[Signed] USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

Bank Issues Notice on Deposits Compensation

LD0504213191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Apr 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In the USSR State Bank: As is known, the USSR presidential decree of 22 March 1991 on the compensation of the population for losses from the depreciation of savings in connection with the one-time [yedinovremennym] increase in retail prices envisages a reassessment of the population's monetary funds in USSR State Bank and USSR Savings Bank deposits.

However, according to the data at hand, versions of payment of compensation on deposits in the USSR Savings Bank are being worked out in certain republics that differ from those determined by the presidential decree of 22 March. In connection with this, the USSR State Bank considers it urgent to announce that the State Bank does not bear responsibility for all decisions adopted on the upgrading of deposits that differ from those established by the presidential decree of 22 March.

Soviet Banks Change Ruble Exchange Rate

LD0404122791 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 4 Apr 91

[Summary] Today 35 Soviet banks are changing ruble [R] rates for hard currency. Foreign tourists can change any amounts at the following rates:

R27.60 for U.S. $1.00
R4.84 for 1.00 French franc
R48.18 for 1.00 pound sterling
R16.44 for 1.00 Deutsch mark

Soviet citizens can only buy a total of $200 annually for foreign trips.

Rules Changed To Keep Cafeteria Prices Down

PM0704152191 Moscow TRUD in Russian 5 Apr 91 p 1

[Interview with USSR Finance Minister V. Orlov by correspondent V. Karpov; place and date not given: "Government Response"]

[Text] On Wednesday the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and Finance Ministry urgently adopted a decision to expand the December instruction from the USSR State Committee for Statistics "On the Composition of Funds Channeled Into Consumption." The new addition says that enterprises may compensate cafeterias and refreshment rooms for the increase in retail prices from the profit left at their disposal after taxes have been paid. TRUD correspondent V. Karpov asked USSR Finance Minister V. Orlov to comment on this decision.

[Orlov] Imagine that you work at a plant. Only yesterday it cost you 1 ruble [R] to eat in the cafeteria, but after the increase in prices it costs R2 or even more. A not very usual or agreeable situation. But through the compensation permitted under the new instruction, which is given not to you personally but to the enterprise, prices can either be maintained at the former level or slightly raised. Everything depends on what the plant or factory decides.

[Karpov] Yet enterprises, particularly profitable ones, could subsidize public catering even before. At some plants prices in the cafeterias were set at a purely nominal rate. So what has changed?

[Orlov] The fact that this expenditure will not now be taxed. And enterprises will not be fined for an increase in the consumption fund due to compensation for catering.

[Karpov] But what can enterprises and organizations which do not make a profit—either budget-financed or unprofitable ones—do?

[Orlov] If we are talking about a lossmaking plant, it does, after all, have some resources to support it. Let it use those resources for compensation. As regards budget-financed organizations which have 3d-category cafeterias, their increased expenditure on catering will be compensated for out of the union, republic, or local budget.

[Karpov] Will the personal compensation to citizens of R60 be abolished or reduced in connection with the subsidies to cafeterias?

[Orlov] In no way. It is guaranteed to all. The worker does and should receive it...

Cabinet Issues Privatization Instructions

LD0604141591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1200 GMT 6 Apr 91

[Text] In connection with the transition of the national economy to market relations and the appearance of new forms of property, a clear delimitation of rights and responsbilities between the private owners [sobstvennik] of means of production and labor collectives is required. Regarding this, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has adopted an instruction for ministries, together with the appropriate trade unions, to create commissions and to conclude wage agreements for 1992-1995 before 1 July. They should envisage mutual obligations of the sides for providing the economy with the volume of production necessary for normal functioning, and also a complex of social guarantees for working people, depending on the character and conditions of production in the sector.

First Deputy Prime Minister on Economy

LD0704022291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1900 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Interview with Vitaliy Rhusseynovich Doguzhiyev, USSR first deputy prime minister, by correspondent Vladimir Stefanov; place and date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Stefanov] Vitaliy Khusseynovich, an interrepublican commission was set up long ago at the initiative of the USSR president. The commission has a very complicated name which I will read out: for monitoring and coordinating the activities of central and republican bodies in fulfilling economic agreements between the USSR and the republics and stabilizing the socioeconomic situation in the country. You are the head of the commission, and to judge from its name the commission's tasks are very serious and very topical. Could you perhaps describe them in a bit more detail?

[Doguzhiyev] [passage omitted] You have read out the name of the commission and mentioned its tasks, but I would like to stress that if you think about it this encompasses practically the whole of the country's economic complex—In other words, if you view all the issues included in the agreement in conjunction this amounts to most of the country's economic complex. It was therefore decided to go for a new form, under the conditions of the new relationships among the republics, under the conditions not only of market economic relations but also under the political conditions. Because, given that the republics had declared sovereignty, not to recognize that or to pretend that it was not so would have been stupid. On the contrary, what was needed was to think about how, while respect sovereignty, a form of joint action could be found that would suit everyone. And it seems to me that such a form lies in a committee composed of individuals with the power to make decisions—because first deputy heads of government have the power to sign government instructions and, generally speaking, to make decisions. So such a committee, able to examine questions concerning fulfillment of an agreement, will be able to intervene one way or another in the economic situation and influence it. And I would say that, though I had already before this had occasion to meet the republics on the subject of the system of material and technical provision in the country, there had been many disagreements. But gradually, from one meeting to the next such disagreements became fewer. And at the last meeting—I particularly want to draw attention to this—12 republics—excluding the Baltic republics—signed a document on how the system of material and technical provision should work in the second to fourth quarters. They also examined a broad outline for 1992, asking for time till the next meeting to work on it. And it is my view that we will pass this outline at our next meeting. And so, one of the most contentious issues—that of how to organize our life in horizontal and vertical structures—we have in fact defined. And all the republics have come to the conclusion that we have had enough of trying to say who is more important, who should or should not be recognized, that what needs to be understood is that we have to work in an interrelated way and that this is the only way to success. We therefore said that we will act both horizontally and vertically. The horizontal links are those between republics, links among free producers and enterprises; the vertical ones are the coordination and the system of state orders or orders for state deliveries to meet state needs, coming from the center. [passage omitted]

[Sefanov] What is the state of our country's finance and credit system today?

[Doguzhiyev] Yes, you have raised the question that in my view is probably the chief one today. Everything was written down very nicely in the agreement. Even those figures, small as they were, that the republics eventually agreed upon were nevertheless enough to shape a budget. They constituted funds, various funds, including funds for stabilization intended to finance capital investment; funds that might be able to help republics in evening out starting positions, because we all understand this, and the viewers too understand, that not all the republics are starting out from identical positions. So what happened in the end? What happened was that after two months we have nothing in the stabilization fund. the fund we have...that is, the budget formed from taxation and other kinds of revenue has received only one-third of the amount that was due to come in. For instance, I can remember the two-month figures, out of a planned 23 billion roubles [R] only R7 billion came in. [passage omitted]

The inclination of, for instance, Russia, the Ukraine, or the Baltic republics was not to play a part in the stabilization fund. But we are continuing to work with them and we will most likely find some solution. As for the Baltic republics, they are playing no part whatsoever in the shaping of budgets and funds. So when our commission met them I made the following suggestion—we have not actually made a decision on this yet but it is for the next meeting. What I asked was that where a particular republic makes no contribution to any fund or budget, why then keep that republic within the system of material and technical provision? It makes no investment to create capacities or resources, yet it takes the resources. We suggested to the Baltic republics that they should think about this...

[Stefanov, interrupting] Was there any reaction from, for instance, those Baltic republics?

[Doguzhiyev] As yet, no. I would say that all the other republics reacted when we quoted the figures of how much each one was supposed to contribute and how much they actually contributed. Figures were mentioned and over the past two weeks one or two changes have occurred. Where the Baltic republics are concerned there have been no changes yet, though literally just yesterday at talks with the Lithuanian delegation they asked how they might play a part, in general, in our economic system, and gave assurances that they are prepared to cooperate on a mutually beneficial basis. True, you will agree that this formulation mutually beneficial is pretty vague, but at least this is a start.

[Stefanov] Vitaliy Khusseynovich, there is constant talk today about foreign currency. But it strikes me that people talk more about how to distribute foreign currency rather than about how to earn it. Foreign currency is very necessary, it goes without saying, for the purchase of food and medicines, and of consumer goods. But foreign currency is, in point of fact, just as necessary for our economy as a whole, as for industry.

[Doguzhiyev] Vladimir Fedorovich, you were quite right to say that we think more often about how to distribute it. And perhaps that is not entirely our fault. The fact is that for many years we had foreign currency from oil and gas exports and we were pretty free in our attitude toward it. We have acquired the bad habit of, as soon as some difficulty arises or we are unable to get hold of some raw material or manufactured goods, our immediate decision is to resort to foreign currency. We find a firm selling what we want and then: come on, out with the foreign currency! That is how we grew accustomed to living, and perhaps we would have gone on that way without noticing it. But this year, 1991, the time was up for us to pay off credits and debts, which turned out to be twice as big as in any, well, than in 1990. Moreover, last year we met only 83 percent of our export commitment, in other words, that was even less foreign currency coming in. And then not all the credits that had been promised have been drawn up, and so we have found ourselves in a grim position. Experts say they cannot recall the country ever being in such a position. This has had its effect on the food situation because we had planned to import food on credits, but the granting of the credits has been held up. And these are not just bureaucratic hold-ups. Rather, every foreign firm and bank is looking hard at the Soviet Union's ability to pay. And as soon as they sensed that we had began to default on our debts then all drawing-up of credits was suspended.

So, what measures have we set about taking? First of all, we have set additional export quotas. And we have revised the allocation of funds for imports. I believe that if we go ahead with these measures we will be able to correct the import situation probably some time in the next month and there should be an appreciable delivery of materials, raw materials; and if we take other measure then we should notice this happening soon. [passage omitted]

So what conclusion have I come to? Well, despite the state of things the problem of stabilizing the national economy can be resolved. Everyone is currently talking of links having been damaged. But you know, they are damaged for two reasons. The first is the war of laws, with decisions being made, in the face of Union-level stipulations, for not 10 percent but 30 percent to be left with the enterprise; with local bodies placing a prohibition on products leaving the region. And the second reason is the lack of resources, be it because we have brought in less this year, be it because our output volumes are declining. But all these are matters that lie in our own hands. We, as specialists, can see that the economy can pick up, that the decline can be halted. [passage omitted]

[Stefanov] And is it possible to offer a forecast?

[Doguzhiyev] Yes, yes. As I see it, if coal deliveries become normal again, literally within the next week, and we can be sure that within two weeks after that the metallurgy industry will return to normal working, I hope that in May we will resolve the problem of imports and the drawing up of credits—what I was talking about earlier. There is such a certainty. Then I would say that we ought to feel the affects of these changes at the end of May, or in any case early in June. [passage omitted]

Scientific

Gorbachev Greets Space Exhibition

LD0604210191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 6 Apr 91

[Excerpt] Today in Moscow, in the building that was at the exhibition in Montreal and was then returned to the Soviet capital, the "To the Stars" exhibition has started, which is devoted to the 30th anniversary of the flight by Yuriy Alekseyevich Gagarin, the planet's first cosmonaut.

The USSR president sent a message of greetings to those taking part in the exhibition. [passage omitted]

Three Satellites Launched 4 April

LD0804081791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0749 GMT 8 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 8 Apr (TASS)—Here is an announcement about the launch of three satellites which was released here today.

Three artificial earth satellites, Kosmos-2139, Kosmos-2140, and Kosmos-2141 were launched aboard a Proton booster rocket on 4 April 1991 in the Soviet Union. The purpose of the satellites is to continue testing components and equipment for the "Glonass" global space navigation system, which is being established in order to determine the whereabouts of Soviet civil aircraft, ocean-going ships, and fishing vessels.

The satellites have been put into a close to circular orbit, with the following parameters:
—initial period of revolution—11 hours 16 minutes;
—distance from the surface of the Earth—19,148 km;
—inclination of orbit—64.8 degrees.

The equipment on board the satellites is working normally. The coordinating and computing center is processing the incoming information.

Almaz Space Survey Station To Be Activated

PM0404131591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Apr 91

[Report by Petr Orlov, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Orlov] After years of silence, the Almaz orbital station has been officially entered in the Soviet space research program.

The station was launched by a "Proton" rocket in automatic mode. The predecessors of this Almaz orbital station, which was built at the Chelomey Design Bureau, were placed in orbit many years ago under "Kosmos" and "Salyut" codenames. Some of them were even manned. Now this program has been revived with new objectives. It has been announced that (?radar) surveys of our country and other countries in the interests of geology, compilation of accurate maps, study of the oceans, ecology, and agriculture are to be carried out from the Almaz-1 station.

It is planned to create an entire aerospace system on the basis of the Almaz station to study the earth's resources and to complement the scientific programs carried out on the manned Mir station which is in a different orbit.

Construction of 60 Nuclear Power Plants Halted

LD0404085991 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 3 Apr 91

[Text] The Soviet Union has stopped the construction and designing of about 60 nuclear power stations. The power industry ministry has said that this is a result of the anti-nuclear movement following the Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident. However, experts have said that the public's attitude to nuclear power has been changing somewhat. In connection with the serious power shortages in a number of regions of the Ukraine and Russia, the local authorities have had to resume the construction of advanced safety nuclear plants.

Measures Against Chernobyl Radiation Hazards

LD0504202891 Moscow TASS in English 1756 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Veronika Romanenkova]

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—Although the effect of the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear accident are still felt, a complex of technical and hygienic, medico-biological, agrotechnical and organisational measures taken over these years made it possible to prevent radiation hazard for people inhabiting the contaminated territory, professor Usher Margulis, expert of biophysics institute, told TASS.

The assessment of the possible level of irradiation showed that some 280 thousand people residing in zones of rigid control received an average individual dose of external and internal radiation of 3.5 rem in 1986-1989. In 80 per cent of the population, the individual doses of radiation do not exceed five rem, and in only four per cent of the population amount to 17.3 rem (the maximum permissible dose over these years), Margulis said.

The zone of rigid control spreads over the Bryansk, Mogilev, Kiev, Zhitomir and Gomel regions where the density of radioactive contamination surpassed 15 curie per one square kilometer.

Asked how harmful this irradiation is, Margulis said that there can be some 200 cases of malignant tumours among residents of this area in the lifetime of the present generation.

However, there are 2,000 spontaneous cases of cancer per one million people every year. The level of remote consequences is so small that cannot be established against the background of spontaneous malignancies.

Radiation safety of people was achieved by a number of measures that substantially altered their activities. This complicated the conditions of residence in contaminated districts and took a toll in stress. The professor spoke highly of the government programme for the normalisation of activity in zones of rigid control and lifting of all restrictions. He said scientific analysis shows that there are no reasons for restriction when lifetime radiation doses make up 35-70 rem.

Military

All-Army Conference Issues Appeal to Communists

PM0804084391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

[Appeal by delegates to the First All-Army Party Conference to Communists in the USSR Armed Forces]

[Text] Dear Comrades! Combat Friends! Colleagues!

We are appealing to you at a difficult time for the country and the party. The socioeconomic crisis has reached danger level. Our people's socialist gains and the integrity of the multi-ethnic Soviet state have been placed in jeopardy. Political opposition has assumed the character of extremely acute confrontation. Anarchy and violence are increasing in some regions, and human casualties are multiplying.

The CPSU, the Army, and law-enforcement organs are being subjected to frenzied attack. Destructive extremist forces have set in train political and moral terror and a social blockade; calls for civil disobedience are to be heard. At this difficult time we urge all working people and Army and Navy servicemen to rally round and take vigorous action to uphold our socialist gains and strengthen the USSR.

We appeal to Communists, nonparty people, veterans, young people, and all servicemen, to their conscience, honor, courage, and staunchness. Let us rally our ranks in the name of our homeland's security and future and in order to do our utmost to strengthen the combat readiness of the USSR Armed Forces.

We urge every communist to get closer to people, to place himself at the heart of people, in troop collectives, barracks, officers' quarters, firing ranges, and tank training sites. It is here that we should set an example of conscientious labor, moral purity, comradeliness, friendship, presence of mind, and organization.

Say "no" to pessimism, confusion, and political and professional passivity. We counter attacks on socialism, on Lenin, and on the party with our ideological conviction, Bolshevik unity, and will. Truth in word and deed is our weapon.

We urge you to insistently continue the democratization of party life, shape an atmosphere of collectivism, party-minded comradeliness, glasnost, criticism, and self-criticism within party organizations, and indeed transform them into centers of ideological-political and cultural education for communists and all personnel.

We urge all honest people to take part in constructive dialogue and the quest for creative initiatives and practical solidarity. In conjunction with trade union, youth, and other organizations operating within the framework of the USSR Constitution, we are ready for all-around cooperation and joint actions in the interests of ensuring the reliable security of the homeland, implementing military reform, and scaling qualitatively new heights in combat training and service and in strengthening law and order and discipline.

We are convinced that today, at the moment of choice, each one of us will worthily do his duty to the party and the fatherland.

All-Army Party Conference Resolution

91UM0536 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

[Resolution of the First All-Army Party Conference: "On the Present Situation and Measures for Ideological Unification and Organizational and Political Consolidation of the Party Organizations of the USSR Armed Forces"]

[Text] 1. The First All-Army Conference has completed the period of formation of electoral organs of CPSU organizations of the Army and Navy and organizationally secured the creation of a unified party organization of the USSR Armed Forces as a component of the CPSU.

The party organization of the USSR Armed Forces operates on the basis of the USSR Constitution and legislation of the USSR. It is guided by the CPSU Program and Rules and by the rulings of the supreme governing organs of the party, as well as by the Instructions on the Work of CPSU Organizations in the USSR Armed Forces.

2. Evaluating the present situation and expressing the will of a body of more than one million communists in the Army and Navy, the conference resolutely opposes the process of eliminating parties from the Armed Forces, condemns communist servicemen who leave the CPSU in these times that are difficult for the party and for the whole country, and declares the fidelity of the personnel of the USSR Armed Forces to the USSR Constitution, socialist choice, and the policy of comprehensive renewal of Soviet society.

Acknowledging its responsibility before the fatherland, the communists of the Armed Forces favor the further implementation of perestroyka, the consolidation of the USSR as a united federative socialist state, and the immediate signing of the Union treaty. They consider it necessary to take more decisive measures to uphold the social system in the country, they condemn the activities of antisocialist, nationalist, and separatist forces, and they repudiate attacks on the military and attempts to disparage its importance to society.

The party organization of the USSR Armed Forces considers its most important duty to be to provide for the defense capability of the country at a level of reasonable sufficiency and for the organized implementation of military reform to preserve a united USSR Armed Forces, to support high combat and mobilization readiness of the Armed Forces, to unify personnel, and to mobilize them to fulfill their civic duty to defend the state.

3. To consider the main goal of all communists of the Army and the Navy to be the ideological unification of party ranks on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and aggressive and purposeful work to replenish their ranks with leading servicemen and to implement the rulings of the 28th CPSU Congress and of the supreme organs of the party to defend the USSR Constitution, and to realize in the activities of the troops (forces) the policies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the president of the USSR, and the government of the USSR.

For party organizations to persistently ensure that each member of the CPSU becomes a political fighter for the party, consistently raises his ideological and theoretical level, masters modern forms of political struggle, takes an aggressive position on life, and takes a direct part in the education of the personnel of the Army and Navy by explaining to them the ideologies of V.I. Lenin, the ideals of the Great October Revolution, the strategies and tactics of perestroyka, the role and place of the USSR Armed Forces and by revealing the activities of anticonstitutional forces.

For the all-Army party committee and its bureau to carry out concrete measures to increase ideological and educational efforts with each communist, to impart to them political stability and ideological maturity, to persistently work to keep ideological work from lagging behind the realities of life, and to show initiative in the formation of public opinion in military collectives.

To establish the active provision of political information to members of the CPSU. To restructure the system of party training and theoretical and practical training of the ideological aktiv and of each communist. To more fully make use of all forms and methods of ideological work, the possibilities of verbal agitation and propaganda, and the mass media. To resolve the question of the creation of all-Army district (group, fleet) organs of the periodical press.

For the party committees to ensure the active participation of communists in general political actions to defend the cause of V.I. Lenin and to consolidate the unity of the Army and the people and in mass military and patriotic measures dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the Victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War.

4. For party committees and supervisory commissions to take measures to further organize the political consolidation of party organizations. To consider the most important directions of their activities to be to provide for the efficient operation of the reformed party structures, to strengthen their vertical ties among themselves, to ensure independence in work within the framework of the CPSU Rules and unity of the activities of communists on the platform of the party Program, to establish an efficient system of party information, and to intensify the efforts, first and foremost, of the primary party organizations.

Within party organizations, to conduct wide and concerned discussion of the new CPSU Program and to summarize everything valuable that practical party work has created in the years of perestroyka.

To make fuller use of the accumulated positive experience of efforts to turn party organizations into the political core of the military collectives and to ensure the personal example of each communist in service and conduct. To more actively support social principles in party work and to reinforce horizontal structures that have proven themselves, soviets of secretaries, and multicandidate and public elections of the party aktiv.

For party committees and primary party organizations to develop Leninist norms of party life, to raise the culture of relations between communists, and to foster party fellowship, solidarity, and responsibility before the party collective.

While developing the process of democratization of interparty life, to take measures to ensure the strict observation of the requirements of the CPSU Rules in each party organization, to ensure supervision and the obligation to carry out party rulings and commissions, and to reinforce party discipline. To constantly analyze the state of the party ranks and the placement of communists.

Under conditions of independence of party organizations in their acceptance of people for membership in the CPSU, to improve the system for replenishing the party ranks, educating young communists, and forming in them the qualities of political fighters of the party. To pay attention to those who leave the ranks of the CPSU and ensure glasnost when examining their statements.

With the goal of revealing the opinions of communists on timely issues of party life, clarifying the real state of party forces inside party organizations and increasing confidence in the possibilities of the party, to improve experience in conducting individual interviews with members of the CPSU.

5. For party committees and party organizations, on the basis of the 28th congress resolution "On Basic Directions of Military Policy of the CPSU at This Present Stage," to master their new place and role in the general system for ensuring the security of the USSR and implementing programs of military reform. By means of party methods of operation, to have an influence on the problems of combat and mobilization of troops and Navy forces, to ensure that communists set an example in the fulfillment of their official duties, and to demonstrate constant concern for the improvement of their military skills and professional competency and for the creation of the necessary conditions permitting them to most fully make use of existing reserves, opportunities, and the creative potential of communists and all personnel for qualitative resolution of the tasks of combat and operational training, alert duty (service), and mastery and use of equipment and weapons.

To form and foster among communists and all personnel a legal culture and a respectful attitude toward laws, the military oath, and military regulations, to create in multiethnic military collectives a healthy moral atmosphere, and to raise their commitment toward the life and health of people and the reinforcement of military discipline and law and order.

For the party organizations to work out measures and take active participation in the fulfillment of the comprehensive program of social development of the Armed Forces to the year 2000, to demonstrate daily concern for the needs and inquiries of communists and all servicemen, laborers, clerical workers, and members of their families, and to react in a strict and principled manner to violations of law and social justice.

Relying on social opinion, democratization of official relations, and the broadening of glasnost, for party organizations to make full use of their rights and opportunities to select and place military personnel and to actively oppose nonobjectivity and protectionism in the evaluation of their activities and their official career.

6. For party committees, as the basic structural links of party organization of the Armed Forces, to improve the style of their activities, to overcome the inertia of the period of reorganization and formation, and by their practical affairs and action declare their independence, consolidating role, and ability to lead communists in the resolution of current problems.

For the all-Army party committee to render aid to newly elected committees of units, institutions, combined units, military training institutions, armies and flotillas, districts and navies, the central apparat, and branches and services of the Armed Forces in the establishment and organization of practical activities in regard to general party proposals and specific tasks decided by the military collectives where they are elected.

To demonstrate concern for the ideological and professional growth of party personnel and their social protection in accordance with the status approved by the

CPSU Central Committee and the rulings of the government of the USSR. To organize training and retraining of the newly elected party aktiv.

7. On the basis of rulings of the 28th CPSU Congress, the law "On Public Associations," and the accumulated experience of party work, for the party committees to improve the mechanism of relations between party organizations and organs of military administration, military political organs, and public associations and organizations. To take part in joint efforts to resolve key problems in the training of the Armed Forces, to educate military personnel, to enforce undivided authority, to increase the authority and responsibility of communists for the state of affairs in assigned areas of official activity, to educate personnel, and to provide social and legal protections for them.

Via communists elected to membership in officers assemblies, women's councils, and various commissions, as well as trade unions and Komsomol and other organs, to support the operation of democratic institutions in the Armed Forces and to conduct CPSU policy in military and labor collectives.

To demonstrate constant concern for the efficiency of the work of communists elected to soviets of people's deputies. To work out with them unified approaches to timely questions of the military policy of the party and the life and activities of the Armed Forces. To respond in a timely fashion to their proposals and inquiries and actively influence the activities of deputies clubs.

For party committees to establish close ties with local party organs and actively interact with them in the implementation of rulings of party congresses and plenums and of decisions of the CPSU Central Committee, in the organization of military and patriotic education, and in the training of youth for service in the USSR Armed Forces.

To support the veterans movement, to develop ties with healthy forces of public organizations at the local level, and to more fully make use of their efforts in the interest of reinforcing unity of the Army and the people and preparing for replenishment of troops.

To demonstrate initiative in bringing before the CPSU Central Committee, the president of the USSR, and the USSR Ministry of Defense questions concerning the most important problems of the daily functions of the troops (forces) and of party work.

For the supervisory commissions in their practical activities to be strictly guided by the CPSU Rules and decisions approved by the appropriate organs, to monitor the implementation of the rulings of congresses and conferences and the observation of democratic principles in the activities of party committees, to resolve issues connected with the observation by communists of party discipline and norms of public morals, to defend the rights, honor, and dignity of members of the party, and to carry out systematic supervision of the implementation of the party budget and the conduct of the economic activities of institutions of the party committees. To take party action against people guilty of suppressing criticism, abusing their official position, and committing other violations of the norms of party life.

To recommend that all party committees support close interaction with supervisory commissions created on questions of the practical execution of the CPSU Rules and rulings of the party congresses. Together with the supervisory commissions, to persistently attempt to achieve unity and purity of Army party ranks and improvement of the authority and independence of local party organizations.

The party conference charges the All-Army Party Committee with examining and defining the necessary structure and number of its party apparat, the organization of its activities, and the material and technical supply and financing of all party organs of the Armed Forces. It is considered advisable to establish special funds of party committees which stimulate aggressive activities of party organizations in the Army and the Navy.

To charge the All-Army Party Committee with studying and summarizing the recommendations and wishes received from the delegates to the conference, including those concerning individual provisions of the Instructions on the Work of Organizations of the CPSU in the USSR Armed Forces, and with issuing appropriate proposals to the CPSU Central Committee.

Navy Faces Budget, Conversion Issues

OW0804093891 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 2230 GMT 30 Mar 91

["Serving the Fatherland" program hosted by correspondent Sergey Yurakov, featuring Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the USSR Navy; Vice Admiral A.M. Ustyantsev; I.V. Koksanov, USSR minister of the shipbuilding industry; V.M. Pashin, director of the Leningrad Academician A.N. Krylov Central Scientific Research Institute of Shipbuilding Industry; and A.N. Dondukov, general designer of the A.S. Yakovlev Experimental Design Bureau]

[Text] [Yurakov] The Baltic plant is the cradle of the best domestic ships. But some of them also die here. Immediately following the war an uncompleted Sovetskiy Soyuz class battleship was scrapped at the Baltic plant. After the death of the generalissimo, a Stalingrad class cruiser was destroyed here, and at the end of the 1950's the blowtorches dismantled a Sverdlov class cruiser.

Now history repeats itself. In one of our programs we showed you the dismantling of the unfinished structures of the Kirov class nuclear powered cruiser whose keel was laid here. The same inglorious fate befell a Slava class cruiser in Nikolayev. Despite the fact that these ships were not really nearing completion, the fleet will nevertheless have to compensate for losses to the shipbuilding industry to the tune of 12 million rubles [R]. [video cuts to show Yurakov interviewing Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin]

[Yurakov] How would you assess the combat capabilities of Kirov and Slava class cruisers?

[Chernavin] I consider these ships quite modern. They were built according to elevated contemporary standards and are the pride of our fleet.

[Yurakov] With its special features, the nuclear powered missile cruiser Kirov has no counterpart in foreign fleets. The cruiser carries powerful offensive weapons which enables it to destroy surface ships at great distances. Its defensive weapons ensure antimissile, anti-aircraft, and antisubmarine defenses for the cruiser itself and for the battle group as well. The ship's powerful nuclear propulsion unit permits it to undertake long voyages to any part of the ocean.

The missile cruiser Slava differs from the cruiser Kirov mainly in the types of offensive weapons it carries, its gas turbine propulsion system, and its less sophisticated antisubmarine weapons. [video shows Yurakov talking to Chernavin]

Does our fleet need these types of ships?

[Chernavin] These ships are necessary. Restrictions on Navy funding in connection with overall budget cuts for the Defense Ministry, however, have forced us to abandon some of our previous plans to some extent; we have had to amend them and reconcile them with our resources.

[Yurakov] The military doctrine of reasonable sufficiency in defense was adopted too hastily in our country to be adequately substantiated scientifically. Could it be that its announcement was to some extent a propaganda move?

[Chernavin] I think that this term, reasonable sufficiency, deserves to exist. But we must set some limits here. It is one thing from a political point of view. Here I think this term is valid. But it is another thing for us military specialists. I think we cannot be guided by this term in full or sufficient measure, because if this term is comprehensible in a general political way, it means absolutely nothing militarily.

Once more, as far as the term reasonable sufficiency is concerned, it seems to me that the question of ensuring the country's defense unconditionally is so important and is of such decisive significance that it is even difficult to say whether reasonable sufficiency or possibly sufficient reasonableness should be our principal attitude on this most important issue.

[Yurakov] Can our country afford costly ships like the heavy aircraft carriers?

[Chernavin] I would say that it is dangerous to simply judge things by their low cost and to place our bets on cheap weapons. Cheap weapons can result in costly losses. If we maintain that the fleet must be modern, then it must have all the appropriate components in order to ensure its combat stability so that it can fulfill its set tasks.

Ships without cover—and one of the major forms of cover is jet fighters—are helpless and defenseless regardless of the might of their offensive weapons and personnel become...[changes thought] they would be sent to a sure death and certain destruction. So there are two possibilities, first to pursue a penny-pinching course and send our ships and our people to their destruction—this would be cheap. There is a second way, when we do not consider human life cheap and want to ensure the survival of these people in a complex combat situation during fulfillment of set tasks.

I think that every normal person would choose the second path over the first. I think that an accountant's penny-pinching approach to everything, choosing only that which is cheap, is a ruinous course which can lead our country and our armed forces into an impasse for which our people will have to later pay for with millions and millions of lives of Soviet people. We have gone through all this before. Why should we go through it again? [Video cuts to show Yurakov interviewing Vice Admiral A.M. Ustyantsev on the deck of an Admiral Kuznetsov class aircraft carrier]

[Yurakov] The keels of new cruisers are presently being laid. They say that if we do not build one of these we could save enough money to provide housing for all homeless officers?

[Ustyantsev] I would respond to this topic as follows. Our economists, Georgiy Arbatov, and Major Lopatin are looking for money in the wrong places. The search for money should be centered in the backyards of our plants and factories where equipment purchased abroad for 200 to 250 billion [currency not specified] lies around without use or purpose.

Another point is the export of raw materials abroad, round timber and metals such as titanium, copper, lead, aluminum, and many other raw materials that are shipped out as ingots for next to nothing. We could rake up enough not only to build one aircraft carrier, we could cover the whole country with high quality houses. [video cuts to show a montage of shots of flight operations on U.S. aircraft carriers]

[Yurakov] Aircraft carriers embody the highest level of technology; it is no coincidence that the Americans call their aircraft carriers super weapons. [video returns to Ustyantsev interview]

Our technical lag is known. In view of this, is it possible to create truly efficient equipment as complex as a cruiser? It is not for nothing that some deputies say that it is no more than a pile of metal unfit for action.

[Ustyantsev] This is a totally incorrect view. I know the working class, the engineering and technical personnel, all the way up to the minister of the shipbuilding industry, well enough. This is the most developed industry in our state. The technology, the skill, and professionalism of the aforementioned people permits construction of even higher and better quality, as for example, even aircraft and equipment. The problem lies in the people's attitude to this matter. But I would say that if the working class of Russia, all of Russia, and of the Soviet Union worked in the same way as workers of the shipbuilding industry, say at the Nikolayev Plant or the Severodvinsk Plant of the SMP [Northern Maritime Steamship Line] we would have eliminated these economic difficulties some 20 years ago. [video cuts to show Yurakov interviewing I.V. Koksanov, USSR minister of the shipbuilding industry]

[Koksanov] The shipbuilding industry creates and builds all of the Navy's ships, from submarines and large surface ships to auxiliary vessels. The shipbuilding industry provides and is engaged in creating ships for the maritime transport fleet, fishing fleet, and riverine fleet, although this may not be entirely true as it may not provide absolutely everything. In connection with operations on the shelf we began and for several years we have been building a broad range of equipment for oil and gas production on the shelf.

It should be mentioned that the shipbuilding industry satisfies 60 to 70 percent of its own needs in equipment and machinery. In other words, along with the shipbuilding branches there are broadly developed machinery and instrument manufacturing branches. How can the industry be preserved under conditions of conversion so as not to lose its aspect, not to lose the structure of shipbuilding, not to shatter all the ties that exist in the deliveries of components, equipment, materials, and so forth, under conditions of decreased spending on military needs?

The first thing that we did was that we tried to preserve our base plants, institutes, and design bureaus under conditions of ongoing conversion so as not to lose the foremost technology that we have developed and in order to be able to increase the volume of output of equipment if the demand arises using the technologies developed directly at enterprises and plants manufacturing military equipment. [video cuts to show extensive building complex, laboratories, and test facilities of the Leningrad Academician A.N. Krylov Central Scientific Research Institute]

[Yurakov] Now if history repeats itself, how can such an enormous scientific center as the Leningrad Academician Krylov Central Scientific Research Institute be protected from its whims? The world's largest scientific shipbuilding center includes some 100 buildings and occupies an area of 84 hectares. A whole series of unique structures can be found here, such as the deep-water ocean tank which is almost 1.5 kilometers long. It has an ice, circulating, and ocean-going pools. A whole complex of unique test rigs is located on the institute's territory, including power engineering, hydrodynamic, materials strength, and aerodynamic test rigs. The institute also has its own experimental production facilities for the output of unique fixtures, equipment, and devices.

In terms of the complex nature of research and opportunities for carrying out experiments, only the (Taylor) center of the United States Navy is comparable to the Krylov Institute. More than 500 doctors and candidates of sciences and more than 2,000 highly skilled engineers capable of solving the most complex scientific tasks work here. The main subject of Krylov institute workers is forecasting the development of domestic ship building, examining plans for ships and vessels that are on the drawing boards, and conducting research in the fields of hydrodynamics, ship propulsion, strength, and automated design systems.

In its work in these spheres the institute maintains close ties with the academies of sciences and enterprises of various branches. The Krylov Center is also a prominent member of a number of international organizations. [video cuts to show Yurakov interviewing V.M. Pashin, director of the Academician A.N. Krylov Central Scientific Research Institute]

What fundamentally new things has the utilization of computer equipment brought to your institute's work?

[Pashin] The most important thing found in these systems is that today these systems have advanced to such an extent that they permit us to begin solving intellectual level tasks with the aid of computers. If previously the entire burden fell on the designer and all decisions were made only by the designer and the planner, today, when maritime equipment has become extremely complex, the designer is often unable to review every possible solution. It is here, of course, that computers will naturally render us invaluable assistance.

Today we can elaborate a variety of versions of a general layout of a ship. Today we can turn this ship around and view it in various planes and see how its separate elements combine. Today we have already seen on screen how theoretically the surfaces of these ships and vessels can be prepared by machines. Now this is an incredibly labor intensive and no less responsible operation that was previously done by hand and took both a lot of time and demanded the highest skills. Today this can all be done with the help of modern computers.

[Yurakov] Computerization requires a lot of money. Where will you get the necessary funds if financing of defense related scientific research and experimental design work is being cut?

[Pashin] The way I see it the most important task today is to preserve the scientific and technical potential. Now where do I see the main problem here and why must we act precisely in this way? Today, as you know, financing of military equipment procurement is being cut. Consequently the number of units required for defense will be less, and consequently the efficiency of every unit must increase. Now essentially we are talking about achieving results not through numbers but through skill. Yet if we say that the efficiency of each unit must increase insofar as there are less of them, then we must not talk about decreasing the previous level or maintaining it, but possibly quite the contrary, about increasing the rate of scientific design and scientific and technical developments. Consequently we should have a very solicitous attitude toward this potential. So under no circumstances should we talk about cutting the financing of scientific research and experimental design work.

Now a different questions arises, what about the personnel, the personnel engaged in science and design departments of the branch? Today, due to a whole series of reasons that are fully explainable, very highly professional and high-class specialists and scientists have become concentrated in defense branches of industry. So today, when conversion is being implemented, when the number of military orders is decreasing, I think it would be incorrect to simply give up these people, particularly the creative part of these collectives. This potential is more flexible. If we want to discuss conversion, particularly of the scientific and technical part of the defense complex, I would like to reiterate that it would be better to load up these scientific and technical complexes with other national economic tasks.

Given the enormous potential, the fact that they are specialists of the highest order, that the equipment is excellent, and the computer equipment is modern I am sure they would cope. This would be simpler and cheaper for the state and, I would say, a great savings in time when compared to establishing new structures of this sort, training new scientific personnel, and creating new research methods today in branches of the national economy that are not part of the defense establishment. I am sure that in terms of both time and funds this would mean less overheads for the state.

Now the response to your question, where to get money for computerization, stems from this. I think that if the rate of financing which was maintained up to the present time is preserved and in some areas, particularly in the sphere of foremost technologies, even increased, then this will be of great benefit both to solving the defense tasks with less funds, in terms of purchasing military equipment, and for the overall national economy.

[Yurakov] Now are you satisfied with the state of financing of scientific research work in the branch?

[Pashin] Some foreign scientific centers are completely supported by the state. The state understands that scientific research and experimental design work means the establishment of a scientific potential and insurance for future successes. Ultimately this ensures the progress of all industries, of the entire national economy. It ensures the country's progress. [video cuts abruptly to show Koksanov talking]

[Koksanov] Of course, conversion is occurring under difficult conditions, but I will say this, that for now, for today, unlike in other industries, I consider that, in 1991 and 1992 we are not threatened with unemployment. We have looked at these questions in the light of the five-year plan, and the work load of our enterprises, in the main, is assured.

Things are somewhat worse with our designers and scientific personnel. However, I think that we will find the right solutions to these questions by involving scientific and design bureaus more on a contract basis, and not as before, when they mainly relied on a budget. But naturally, science can not exist without budget allocations, therefore, a significant portion of budget allocations are envisaged for the development of the fundamental sciences for the needs of the shipbuilding industry. [video cuts to show a montage of U.S. ships and naval weapons systems in action]

[Yurakov] Western countries do not consider it onerous to support major scientific centers with the state budget. Western firms earn billions from the sale of warships and do not disdain the arms business. [video cuts to show Yak-38 aircraft in various stages of operation.]

The Yak-38 vertical takeoff and landing aircraft has operated from aircraft carrying cruisers of the Navy for the past 15 years. The creation of such a fundamentally new combat aircraft was a great achievement for the domestic aviation industry. This unusual aircraft was created by the design bureau, which was headed by the prominent Soviet aircraft designer, Yakovlev. This year, Aleksandr Sergeyevich Yakovlev would have been 85. Now his name has been adopted by the Moscow Skoryy Machine Building Plant, which he headed. Designer Yakovlev, gifted in many ways, managed to form a design collective capable of solving the most varied problems. One of Yakovlev's last projects was the vertical takeoff and landing aircraft. [video cuts to show Yurakov interviewing A.N. Dondukov, general designer of the A.S. Yakovlev experimental design bureau].

What new combat aircraft is your design bureau working on?

[Dondukov] Traditionally, now, we are working in the area of vertical takeoff and landing aircraft.

This class of aircraft, regrettably, is not very much in favor with the Air Force. It is supported by the Navy, but not to the proper extent to ensure this program's success in the near future. In this connection I must say that, if the 1989-1990 rate of funding continues, we simply cannot talk of success for this class of aircraft. We can only say one thing now—that we are roughly 10-15 years ahead of our contemporary U.S. and British counterparts. Nevertheless we are experiencing the very hard conditions of, I would say, the uncontrolled period of perestroyka; as a result success in this sphere is still very much in doubt and, regrettably, the firm will be forced to seek methods of funding under quite different conditions—which we still find difficult. But we are now coordinating the resolution of this task with the Navy and Air Force commanders in chief, along with their armaments deputies, and proposals have been submitted to the government.

[Yurakov] What if the country does not have the money: Where will you get it from?

[Dondukov] I think that integration is one way of resolving this task—integration with world aviation enterprises. We have an offer from India. There are offers from other countries regarding their participation in the joint development of this class of aircraft, especially since the recent sophisticated war in Iraq showed the need for and the significance of this class of weapon. I must say that it was not only the—so to speak—attacking side, on the side of the U.S.-led international forces, that demonstrated the resolution of these tasks with AV-8B and Harrier II aircraft. In the first hours of the war these aircraft took off from their, so to speak, staging airfields—aircraft carriers—to hit airfields and prevent enemy aircraft from taking off at will because their runways had been destroyed. This modern method whereby effectively the whole war was resolved by the air forces, the marine corps, and naval aviation, I think, should vividly show us what lies in store in the near future in local clashes or any other potential combat operations.

[Yurakov] But joint production of arms is effectively a form of arms trade.

[Dondukov] I think that this is the way—at this difficult period with all the difficulties of perestroyka—to assemble the specific resources to somehow eliminate both our budgetary and economic deficiencies. We must just control how much we sell and to whom.

[Yurakov] How do you think that we can preserve the defense industry's scientific and technological potential?

[Dondukov] I consider one option to be virtually essential. That is to sell all our arms to interested parties abroad.

Yet when we talk about expenditure on defense capability, on arms, expenditure on arms—there must be two types of spending. There must be something going out and something coming in. If this "Delta" [as heard], which today compensates us for the shortcomings that have developed in the economy, can be turned into liquid assets by selling arms, I think this is quite normal and quite feasible, and we must avail ourselves of this opportunity.

[Yurakov] After accumulating vast intellectual potential in the course of its work, the renowned design bureau found itself in a difficult position as a result of the cut in military spending. The collective will now be forced to share its achievements. A decision is currently being drafted for the design bureau to set up an association to produce and sell military hardware. The association aims to obtain funds to finance new developments and resolve the collective's social and domestic problems. Other aviation design bureaus in our country intend to set up similar associations. This will enable them to trade independently on the foreign market and enter into the economic relations characteristic of Western countries. This will obviously make it possible to extricate progressive defense-industry enterprises from the deadlock caused by lack of funding for conversion and bring them onto the extensive foreign market.

The Gulf war was not only a publicity stunt advertising state-of-the-art arms but also gave the arms trade a mighty boost.

[Ustyantsev] If I were president, I would sell the Su-27K and the MiG-29K, which are in tremendous demand on the market today. The cost is indeed considerable for that class of aircraft—40 million, perhaps 45 million [currency not specified]. Multiply that by 100 and that would be a lot of money for the state. As for the practical aspects of this question—people may ask: How come the Soviet Union is selling military hardware? All capitalist countries sell military hardware. As far as I know, very recently the United States sold the F-16 to the Arab Emirates. And a substantial number of them. Maybe even a hundred. If we do not sell, someone else will. Business is business. Sales of military hardware would greatly benefit the state.

The conversion about which we are currently talking—this is my profound conviction, and I should know since I visit plants, factories, and institutes and can see for myself—our conversion so far is tantamount to breaking up new machinery with a hammer. We are destroying science. We are destroying the working class, which is dispersing to join cooperatives. These people do not want to make either pots and pans or washing machines. If we have an aircraft factory, let it produce aircraft. If we have an engine plant, let it produce engines. After all, an aircraft engine fetches between one and two million. You can call that money. We could sell engines instead of forcing people who know how to make aircraft engines to produce vacuum cleaners, for example. I would call that conversion. That is to say, we should utilize the potential of existing plants and apply their wide-ranging scientific potential throughout the Soviet Union. That is what I would call conversion, rather than destroying existing production facilities which are well run-in. To produce equipment to make jam or sausage, for example, it is necessary to adapt a plant for this purpose, vacate production premises, buy new equipment... And in my opinion the necessary expenditure exceeds the gain. On the other hand, if a sensible approach were adopted, as some comrades are suggesting, we could be "in clover" as the saying goes: We would have enough to feed the country not just with bread but with butter too.

[Yurakov] The "Severnoye" Production Association is a machine-building enterprise located in Severodvinsk. It is a key naval shipbuilding complex, the cradle of the Soviet nuclear submarine fleet.

Unique shipbuilding facilities, unparalleled in the world shipbuilding industry, have been built here in the Far North. Top-notch production techniques are being used. Production units are fitted with unique equipment which makes possible precision machining of large-dimension components weighing many tonnes. Quality control of welded components is carried out by means of radiography, ultrasound flaw detection, and [?acoustic emission].

The high-tech potential of this enterprise, the skill and qualifications of its engineering and technical staff and workers, and the prestige which attaches to the production of the most sophisticated defense equipment place this enterprise on a par with the world's major companies capable of translating projects of the highest complexity into reality. The Severodvinsk shipbuilders have built most of the Soviet nuclear-powered submarines, including the strategic missile-carrying submarines. The world's first submarine equipped with ballistic missiles was launched here, as was the first Soviet-made nuclear-powered submarine, and the world's first nuclear-powered submarine vessel made from titanium alloys. Recently the 1,000th submarine produced since the beginning of Soviet shipbuilding was handed over to the Navy here.

The selfless labor of the Severodvinsk shipbuilders, the efforts of a large number of allied enterprises, and substantial financial investments have made it possible to forge in Severodvinsk a reliable ocean defense shield for the country.

The modern nuclear-powered submarine is a most sophisticated engineering product, which incorporates the latest shipbuilding, nuclear power, missile, and radioelectronic equipment achievements.

To enable the crews of nuclear-powered submarines do to their job well, shipbuilders have sought to equip the submarines with many systems designed to alleviate the hardships of prolonged underwater navigation. A modern missile-carrying submarine has a leisure section with a gymnasium, a sauna, and a small swimming pool.

Cuts in defense expenditure and conversion are forcing the Severodvinsk shipbuilders to seek peaceful uses for the technologies which they have mastered. Recently the country's first "Neptun" vessel was built here for submarine excursions to a depth of 40 meters. It can develop speeds of up to 5 km/h under water. It is equipped with noiseless engines and is very safe to operate. In the event of a malfunction it is capable of surfacing without outside help.

Being born in Severodvinsk, the ships return here to die. However, some nuclear-powered submarines which have been decommissioned have been awaiting their fate here for more than 10 years now. The nuclear reactors remain aboard the submarines. Their salvage requires substantial means which, in view of the cuts in military expenditure, neither the Navy nor the Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry has available.

Because of a lack of funds for the construction of storage facilities, reactor compartments which have already been removed have also been waiting for burial for a long time. This compartment has been bobbing up and down by the enterprise wall for many years now.

[Chernavin] Compared with the Chernobyl saga, the submarines which we are taking out of service do not present a threat to the environment. However, it cannot be claimed either that there is not an element of enhanced risk in this problem.

[Yurakov] Dozens of nuclear-powered submarines have already been decommissioned, but their salvage has only just begun. This submarine was one of the first to be earmarked for dismantling. The submarine salvage problem is going to snowball in the next few years. The point is that the reactor compartments are not being dismantled, but for the time being there is nowhere to store them. There is also a lack of equipment for removing the active zones from submarine reactors.

Something that is totally incomprehensible, in view of the pressing nature of the submarine salvage problem, is the suspension of the construction of a ship-repair slipway—already 80-percent completed—which would make it possible to organize the dismantling of nuclear-powered submarines at the "Zvezdochka" machine-building enterprise.

[Koksanov] Naturally, no plant can resolve this question alone with its own resources. Both the shipbuilding industry and the Navy need budget appropriations to be able to construct costly storage facilities for the burial of reactor compartments. We must bear in mind that at present, because of lack of means, there is essentially no base for the comprehensive dismantling of nuclear-powered submarines. This requires major expenditure. We have prepared a draft government resolution which we are planning to submit to the president. It provides for the inclusion in the Union budget as from 1992 of special appropriations for the construction of dismantling installations and storage facilities for reactor compartments. These are sums in the order of R150-R180 million annually.

I would like, once again, to express gratitude to our naval servicemen and our merchant marine seamen, fishermen, and offshore oil men who operate our equipment. Personally, and also as minister on behalf of our collegium, I would like to assure them that we will seek, as far as we are able, to satisfy all the needs which operational workers may experience, and that we will give them all the assistance they may require. We will do this without fail. You may rest assured of this, dear naval servicemen and merchant marine seamen!

Baltic Republics

U.S. Senators Hold News Conference in Riga

PM0804085991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Irina Litvinova: "U.S. Senators in Latvia"]

[Text] Riga—Five U.S. senators have held a news conference at the Latvian Supreme Soviet on completing a visit to the republic.

D. Boren, chairman of the Senate security commission [komissiya po bezopasnosti], who headed the delegation, spoke of fruitful meetings with Latvian Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Gorbunovs and Council of Ministers Chairman I. Godmanis. The senator emphasized the special purpose of the visit—to support the Baltic states' struggle for independence. It was declared that the United States has never recognized the incorporation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the USSR and continues to hold this view.

The senators told journalists that at meetings in Moscow which were held before the trip to Latvia, they had familiarized a wide circle of statesmen and public figures, including Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, Kryuchkov, Polozkov, Sobchak, and Primakov, with their position on the Baltic question. "We were heard out politely everywhere," Sen. Boren said, "but the reaction varied, and sometimes there was a hint of indignation."

The senators told journalists that one of the purposes of the visit to Moscow was to issue a warning: The normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations will be jeopardized if the USSR resorts to violence in the Baltic region. In Moscow the senators also expressed their viewpoint on talks between the Baltic republics and the USSR. In their opinion, it is necessary to begin constructive talks whose ultimate goal will be the attainment of independence by Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. The senators believe that, if Gorbachev seriously gets down to talks with the Baltic republics, he will demonstrate his former adherence to democratic transformations in the country.

Poll: Ruutel Favored by Estonians, Russians

LD0304103891 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 0600 GMT 3 Apr 91

[Texrt] The Emor firm carried out an opinion poll between 12 and 18 March to find the most popular public figure in Estonia. Both Estonians and Russians chose Arnold Ruutel as their favorite.

Latvian Official Comments on 11 Apr Moscow Talks

LD0604124791 Riga International Service in Latvian 0430 GMT 6 Apr 91

[Excerpt] As I said at the beginning of the broadcast, an agreement was reached in Moscow [on 4 April] that talks would begin on 11 April between the delegations of Latvia and the USSR. Also in Moscow yesterday, a session of the USSR State Arbitration Committee took place, at which the question of the Latvian House of the Press was examined. Present at both of these events was Ilmars Bisers, first deputy chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers. Correspondent Imants Austrins met him today.

[Begin recording] [Austrins] At a meeting in Moscow, at which you were present, an agreement was reached on a meeting between the delegations of the Governments of Latvia and the USSR on 11 April. Has the Latvian side advanced any preliminary preconditions for this meeting?

[Bisers] First of all, I would like to stress that this is not a meeting of government delegations. The USSR delegation has been confirmed by the USSR president, but the delegation of the Republic of Latvia has been confirmed by the Latvian Supreme Council Presidium. Both delegations are composed of government representatives and also legislative deputies. So that these, in their essence, are delegations of a state character. Therefore this also determines the contents of the questions to be discussed, where unavoidably the question of the republic's status will be discussed, which a government delegation alone could not discuss.

Concerning the preliminary conditions, we consistently adhere to the opinion that we are ready to start talks on any day, in any place, and without any previous conditions. Precisely because of this we reacted rather sharply to the announcement by the USSR president, which he presented to both U.S. Secretary of State Baker and several press sources, that the Baltic states were not ready for talks but the USSR was ready, and all the delay was due to the Baltic states.

We have been ready from the very start. The USSR side shifted from one date to another and postponed these talks. Because of that, I am greatly pleased by the fact that yesterday we at last succeeded in coming to an agreement with Mr. Velichko that the talks will begin on 11 April in Moscow.

[Austrins] Are there still any contentious positions?

[Bisers] Well, there are a great many contentious positions; this is why we need these talks. We on our side have compiled a list of questions which, in our opinion, should be discussed at these talks. The USSR side, too, has compiled the same kind of list—I have it here on the table. Obviously at this first meeting we shall have to coordinate these lists. The heads of the delegations, of course, are already carrying out certain work in order that the lists of questions agree. However, this should finally be done by the delegations.

Groups of experts will be formed, and these groups of experts will have to prepare individual agreements, individual understandings. Likewise, also the question of how we would work will have to be agreed on. This first meeting will evidently have more of an organizational character, and at that time, of course, we should not expect to reach decisions. [passage omitted] [end recording]

'Great Difficulties' in Latvian Oil Supplies

LD0304054891 Riga International Service in English 2030 GMT 2 Apr 91

[Text] The Ministry of Energy has announced that the supply of black oil, which is used mainly for heating systems, experienced great difficulties in March. Only 68,000 tonnes of the expected 117,000 tonnes were supplied. No improvement in the situation is expected in the near future.

Stankevicius Interviewed on Talks With Moscow

LD0504091791 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 4 Apr 91

[Report on interview with Ceslovas Stankevicius, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council and head of the Lithuanian delegation on bilateral talks with the USSR, by journalists in Moscow on 4 April; presented by Edvinas Butkus—recorded]

[Text] [Butkus] The Lithuanian delegation returned at 2000 from the Kremlin to the permanent mission in Moscow. There was a brief interview with Ceslovas Stankevicius, the head of the Lithuanian negotiators, by journalists. Roma Pakeniene, Vilnius radio correspondent, recorded the interview and sent it to Vilnius radio by telephone.

[Stankevicius] The atmosphere of the negotiations was difficult in that the other side was not prepared for a more constructive dialogue. We had, in many respects, an opportunity to become convinced that the Soviet Union was adhering to the old political position which hampers and limits. The delegation besides, clearly stated that it did not have necessary authorization to conduct bilateral negotiations.

We defined as a possible aim of the negotiations the regulation of relations between the Republic of Lithuania and the Soviet Union. This definition has prospects if a real content is introduced. I wish to say, however, that on very important issues—the principles of the negotiations—we did not succeed in receiving a satisfactory answer.

As for the most important matter—on the refusal to use force and the threats of using force—we applied all efforts to convince the Soviet side that it was a naturally obvious and essential principle which should be adhered to during the negotiations and in later relations, in order for us to regard them as normal, friendly, and neighborly. The Soviet side was not prepared today to supply such a confirmation of its stand.

The question remains open about the present situation in Vilnius, on the use of force and the seized objects. We wanted to have today an answer concerning Lithuanian television and some other issues, and we only received an answer that the delegation could not resolve this issue and make a decision today. The Soviet Union needs a new political solution to begin negotiations—that is, the Soviet Union must make a decision assessing political and legal reality of the Republic of Lithuania in the present European context. There is no such solut ion so far and the delegation, it seems, did not have either authorizations or instructions to adopt such a stand today.

[Butkus] Ceslovas Stankevicius noted that the Soviet Union's negotiators agreed that the previous agreements between the sides were valid. The succession, however, is formal—they talk about the procedural or regulating problems only. The Soviet Union moreover, was raising at today's meeting unexpected demands.

[Stankevicius] The Soviet Union was putting forward some completely unacceptable demands, like a demand to adhere to and acknowledge the Soviet Union's Constitution, the validity of the Soviet Union's laws, a demand to introduce moratoriums, and some other unacceptable things. A difficult impression remained after the talk, but I see that the Soviet Union's delegation itself was regarding its stance as unprepared for the negotiations.

This is their own assessment, but yesterday Vice Premier Doguzhiyev stated that they were regarding negotiations as possible. It is difficult to imagine this process, but I wish to stress one important matter. A new political regulation [nuostata] is essential. The Soviet Union has not yet taken up a position which is essential for constructive negotiations, that is, negotiations between two states which must end in a political treaty and the recognition of the Republic of Lithuania.

There was talk during the negotiations about the things necessary to conduct bilateral negotiations. They understand that a juridical recognition of Lithuania by the Soviet Union is essential. They were not, however, ready to begin this process today.

We are formulating the aim as the restoration of bilateral relations between the Republic of Lithuania and the Soviet Union; the renewal of the recognition of the independence of Lithuania, bearing in mind, among other things, the principles of the treaty of 12 July 1920, the 11 March act, and the 9 February referendum. These are facts which they are taking into account but which they do not wish to recognize. They do not wish to draw conclusions arising from these facts.

[Butkus] Ceslovas Stankevicius responded to the question by the Vilnius radio correspondent on whether another meeting would take place if the aim of the negotiations is not to be forumulated:

[Stankevicius] We discussed whether it was worth conducting negotiations without any purpose. To examine a set of problems without expecting to achieve any aim and to sign an agreement would be futile. We stated this. I do not know, but time should show whether the Soviet Union will understand the necessity of such an attitude, or whether that this is the only constructive approach.

[Butkus] Ceslovas Stankevicius noted that the Soviet Union, by stating that it would not be necessary to put forward any conditions, was putting forward conditions today. He also noted that the work started previously by the joint working groups and the experts would continue.

[Stankevicius] The groups of experts will have to prepare materials, solutions, or, at least, material for the delegations to discuss and seek solutions. This is a procedural question. Problems to be dealt with by the working groups have been defined in very general terms and I wish to repeat once again that it is very important what content is supplied to these formulas.

The Soviet Union likes very much to apply interpretations which are not generally accepted to each expression, each term, each definition. This is unfortunate. The USSR delegation, I would say, is mostly orientated toward pressure, various psychological and other pressure. There was talk about the problems of the Army, but it was not a businesslike talk in the sense that we did not get any constructive reply about the present actions of the Army in Lithuania. It was only agreed that at the next meeting the delegations will discuss this problem.

[Butkus] As the Vilnius radio correspondent was told by Aleksandras Abisala, another delegation member, minister without portfolio, the problem of the Army was the most important at the meeting. Ceslovas Stankevicius meanwhile, mentioned to the journalists other basic aims of the meeting.

[Stankevicius] We regarded the return of the seized buildings, the violation of human rights, as the most important. We said that even on the eve of this meeting a young citizen of the Republic of Lithuania was injured, that this was continuing, that this was systematic, that this was very important. Of course, we received only formal replies, which demonstrate efforts to disassociate from this problem and interpret it as being unreal, as if we have heard it more than once.

We also heard claims concerning the recent events, the events of January, that, apparently, they did not take place, that somebody was attacking units of the Soviet Armed Forces. They denied that tanks were crushing people. This was General Moiseyev. This explanation has not changed, and it is very regrettable. We did not receive any guarantees on nonuse of force. We can only express great regret and concern. This is concern of all of Lithuania, we said.

The question arises that if there are no attempts by the Soviet Union to pledge not to do this, preparations may be under way to continue to do this. They were always stressing that the Soviet Government was doing nothing to continue this, but I must note that it was doing nothing to prevent this happening in Lithuania. We wanted to hear any guarantee, any confirmation that these efforts would be made.

Ozolas, Butkevicius on Talks

LD0604100591 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Report on 4 April USSR-Lithuanian talks in Moscow by correspondent Roma Pakieniene, incorporating recorded remarks by Lithuanian delegation members Romualdas Ozolas and Audrius Butkevicius]

[Text] [Pakieniene] Today, we shall discuss how the other members of the Lithuanian negotiation delegation assess the meeting and how they see events developing. Supreme Council Deputy Romualdas Ozolas, who said on the eve of the meeting that Moscow probably requries negotiations without results, confirmed he still holds to this after the Kremlin meeting. Moscow needs bargaining, not negotiations, in order to demonstrate to the West that a process of negotiations is taking place after all, he said. Essentially this is tantamount to a game, and I have become even more convinced of this, Ozolas added.

When asked if Lithuania is obliged to take part in this game, Romualdas Ozolas replied:

[Ozolas] There were some moments when I wished we would clearly state that we see no reason to continue discussions. Let us leave this discussion. However, the situation itself is such that we cannot demand all or nothing. By all, we mean recognition of independence. By nothing, we mean breaking off negotiations.

Moscow can not give or (?permit) the all option. I don't know if it will ever permit itself to allow that. Or if it will wish to allow itself to permit that, if it is not forced to permit it. We cannot leave, to avoid seeming to be in error, as we are depicted all the time. For this reason, we are forced to search for a rational momentum, even this irrationality.

[Pakieniene] During the meeting when it became clear that there was no desire to resolve issues, the Lithuanian side proposed that work be turned over to groups of experts to prepare materials, statutes and principles, each in its area of expertise. According to Romualdas Ozolas, the result of the work of these groups will have to be transferred later to the major political agreement. That is the only positive way to resolve matters currently, he said.

The one good thing, he added, is that at yesterday's meeting both sides confirmed the acceptability, now and in the future, of certain agreements, statutes and principles, arrived at last year.

Ozalas believes these agreements will not be rejected. Even if negotiations break off again, they will be needed to renewed. However, in Romualdas Ozolas opinion, not even this represents the most important result of the meeting.

[Ozolas] I think for the first time both the aim of the negotiations and the negotiation principles—the principles of conducting negotiations—were clear. Until now, all these matters had a more ad hoc quality. Efforts have now been made to raise them, even if we do not mention raising them to the international principle level. In defining the negotiations' aim, for the first time in the text of the protocol, our countries are sufficiently and clearly referred to by their real names, the Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. They are not referred to as separate parts, but this full, correct and constitutional description of these countries signifies sufficient [word indistinct].

[Pakieniene] That is only a small step forward, Ozalas continued, especially, in view of the fact that all sorts of unexpected events may soon take place again. He is almost certain that the makeup of this delegation may soon change again, although its status and authorizations will probably remain the same.

Romualdas Ozolals said that he was even more aware of great danger impending in the Soviet Union, Russia and Lithuania. He said he fears that constant use of military force may spill over into a much more pronounced military movement, with new consequences, perhaps even conflict.

Another member of the negotiating delegation, the leader of the country's Defense Department, Audrius Butkevicius, also thinks such fear is justified. First, because the Soviet government and, specifically, the delegation, have not clearly disassociated themselves from people who have already used force in the Baltic countries. They also refused to give clear guarantees about the use of force during the negotiations or its possible use to resolve the Lithuanian and Soviet relationship.

[Butkevicius] Whether force will again be used in the Republic of Lithuania will largely depend on events in the Soviet Union. If everything continues to move in the direction of the destruction and disintegration of the Soviet Union, if new leaders emerge, we can expect yet another blow.

[Pakieniene] The country's Defense Department leader positively assesses yesterday's negotiator's meeting. It is important that the opportunity to talk and make decisions still exists, and that yesterday it was possible to talk about matters which should be solved today, Burkevicius said. On the other hand, both teams acknowledged that the fate of the seized buildings and the return of weapons and property remains unchanged.

[Ozolas] Nothing has changed here, with the exception that this problem was raised in a sufficiently sharp manner, that attention was drawn to the fact that we do not intend to leave this matter drift, and that pressure to resolve this matter as soon as possible will increase. We have the means.

[Pakieniene] One such method, according to Romualdas Ozolas, is to expand contacts with various executive and legislative structures in the Soviet Union. This work is already being carried out, in no small part by Romuldas Ozolas himself. In Moscow, he presented two letters to Internal Affairs Minister Pugo, demanding the return of weapons and other property of the Lithuanian police. He expected to receive a reply at yesterday's meeting. But, after the deputy minister and delegation member, General Demidov, failed to arrive at the Kremlin, it was agreed to met with him in the near future. Before that, Ozolas will try to make the general fulfil his previous promises that it will return weapons taken from Lithuanian policemen, and send to Lithuania a group of people to investigate the activity of the Black Berets and to assess it accordingly.

Lithuanian CP Charged With Unlawful Broadcasting

LD0504221591 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] The Lithuanian radio and television has brought in an action against the Central Committee of the Lithuanian branch of the Soviet Communist Party and against its representative in the Soviet Army-occupied TV, (Gentautas Staevula).

They are charged with unlawful broadcasting on the radio and television or works created by the staff of the Lithuanian radio and television. The puppet of the Communist Party violates the Lithuanian code of civil procedure by using audio and video materials from the stocks of the occupied center without the permission of their authors.

The Lithuanian radio and television has never given permission to the pro-Moscow communists and their official (Gentautas Staevula) to make use of films, radio and television productions made by its staff, says the civil action of the Lithuanian radio and television.

Landsbergis Views Vilnius-Moscow Negotiations

LD0504225891

[Editorial report] Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Russian at 2025 GMT on 4 April carries a 10-minute recorded interview with Vytautas Landsbergis.

The reporter asks: "Bearing in mind that this interview is somewhat unofficial, I will allow myself to put this question: It is interesting to know your opinion. Today there was a report about Gorbachev's meeting with the miners, today negotiations with Lithuania are taking place. Does it seem to you that it is Gorbachev's intention to solve urgent problems?"

Landbergis replies: "I do not know whether it is possible to talk about Gorbachev, his mood, his decisions, or about a structure of some interacting moments around Gorbachev. You know, there used to be talk around the Baltic about Afghanistan, although the war was taking place in Afghanistan itself. But there, really, something is happening. Maybe we sometimes mention too often the name of one man. The leadership, what does the leadership represent? It has displaced a trend toward coercion, in the direction which used to be rejected by Gorbachev himself. Here Gorbachev does not seem to be Gorbachev. Indeed, it is not worth condemning one personality, but the leadership. But the official leader of the leadership has gone in the direction which he used to reject, just like Pavlov, who said that he would not talk, but started talking. Probably, there is sense in talking. As far as Lithuania is concerned, we must welcome this, it is really good that the meeting of the delegations has taken place, that the next meeting has been planned.

"It is true, the distance is long, a whole month is left by the Soviet side, it seems, it has not decided yet, I think. The delegation, maybe, does not have authorization, it even did not have authorization to talk about the return of the seized property. It is laughable. They have stolen the newsprint and are not returning it. What does it look like? What is to be done with such a state? never mind. In this situation they have no authorization to solve even this problem, how to return what has been stolen," Landsbergis says.

He continues: "This means that the Soviet delegation will have to receive authorization and, probably, the leadership will define its stance to the negotiations with Lithuania. Do they have to be real negotiations, as is insisted by the world community, real negotiations, or only sham ones? It may be that matters will turn toward sham negotiations, but one would not like to think this way."

Property Privitization Begins in Lithuania

LD0504133191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0537 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius, 5 Apr (TASS)—Privatization of state property has begun in Lithuania, in deed but not in word. The payment of the one-time allowances which, according to the law of the Lithuanian Republic "On the First Privatization of State Property" adopted on 28 February, could only be used for "acquisition of the objects of privatization (shares)", should begin on 10 April this year.

The government of the republic, implementing this law, has recently approved the size of the one-time state allowances. Persons who reached the age of 35 before 31 December, 1990 will receive payment of 5,000 rubles [R]. Those who were 30 by this time will receive R4,000. The 25-year-olds are entitled R3,000 , 18-year-olds, R2,000, and all who are younger than 18, R1,000.

The population will receive them in the form of a document stating the sum due to them, but they will not be able to get it in cash. This document cannot be sold—it is envisaged by the law that its owner, if he does not use it for acquiring the privatized objects or shares, can grant it "to his husband or wife, parents, children, brothers and sisters by transfering it to this person's investment account". The said payments may also be widely used for acquisition of the apartments, owned by the state and the public funds, which are being privatized.

As the document says, the payments can be received only by the "citizens of the Lithuanian Republic", that is, the inhabitants who have already received or will receive before the beginning of November of this year the temporary certificate of the citizen of the Lithuanian Republic. It can obviously be presumed from this that if, for instance, a person is living and working in the republic—even if he has done so for his entire life, but for some reasons does not have a wish to exchange his USSR citizen's passport for the certificate of the Lithuanian citizenship, he cannot claim the one-time payments.

RSFSR

Further on Final Russian Congress Session 5 Apr

Moscow TV Coverage

LD0504204291

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1900 GMT on 5 April broadcasts its scheduled program of recorded highlights from the Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, People's Deputies in Moscow on 5 April. Russian President Boris Yeltsin announces that deputies should prepare for registration while deputies are taking their seats, followed by the announcement that deputies should now register.

Yeltsin invites Kyshtymov, chairman of the Electronic Voting Commission, to take the floor. Kyshtymov says that the commission has been checking voting results over the last eight days, and that the results of the inquiry have shown that voting is taking place normally, with few interruptions. He asks deputies to register an appeal if they think their vote is incorrectly recorded.

Yeltsin asks deputies whether today is the last day of the congress. He suggests that there should not be any waffling and that the congress should conclude proceedings today. Yeltsin moves on to the next point: the reallocation of powers. He invites Novikov, chairman of the editorial commission for drafting a decison on the reallocation of powers.

Novikov suggests the procedure for discussing the decision. Yeltsin takes a vote on the procedure—it is adopted. Deputy Agrov suggests that the decision can be put to a vote without introducing any amendments. An unidentified deputy then proposes that the fundamentals of the decision be adopted. Applause follows and Deputy Skudnov, followed by Deputy Ivanilo, also propose that a vote be taken on the decision as a whole. Yeltsin asks the deputies whether they want to vote on the decision as a whole, or point by point. Deputies decide to vote on the decision as a whole. An unidentified deputy suggests that the decision must be passed by a two-thirds majority vote. Another unidentified deputy argues that the decision should be debated before any vote. Yeltsin then says that as what is involved is not the personality of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, but reallocation of powers—that is, the Supreme Soviet itself and its Presidium—he wants to take a vote on the decision as a whole. Voting takes place. The decision is not passed. Yeltsin introduces a point-by-point debate on the decision and on amendments to it.

Deputy Rybkin notes that the timescale within which the decision is to be valid has been determined by Yeltsin himself. Why, he asks, is it not included in the decision? Yeltsin proposes that the decision be in force before the RSFSR president comes into office. A roll vote is taken on the decision as a whole, taking into account the amendments. The decision is adopted 607 to 228, with 100 absentions. Yeltsin makes a statement thanking the congress. At 1925 GMT Yeltsin announces a break.

An unidentified deputy on the panel proposes voting on the agenda. He then invites Deputy Busiyanov, chairman of the Commission for Nationalities, to the rostrum. Busiyanov speaks on the national and state structure of the RSFSR and the federative treaty, focusing on the RSFSR's sovereignty and problems connected with the fact that there is no proper Russian ethnic movement.

Deputy Morozov, a pediatrician, takes the floor on the same subject. He speaks in favor of modernization and constitutional reform, and against nationalism. He says we must get it right for the sake of the children.

Deputy Varov protests procedural irregularities. He says the draft has a whole series of very serious shortcomings, and names two: he is worried about the carte blanche given to the constitutional court, and party influence in administration. The drafts should be sent on for further discussion in the Supreme Soviet and commissions, he says.

Deputy Dyakonov says the sovereignty of Russia is the key. Russians have a high mortality rate, and Russia's resources are exploited. Deputies must vote for Russian independence and special presidential powers, he says—every enterprise and producer must also have their sovereignty. Yeltsin is the object of slander, and an information blockade is being maintained against Russia, he concludes.

Deputy Kulakovskiy says that the relevant documents have not been distributed to Congress delegates. The chairman says that criticism is groundless. Deputy Stepanov says that the Union treaty was published on 9 March, so everything is as it should be. Deputy Shcheglovo-Godyayev says it is important to delimit jurisdiction, and Deputies Plechov and Gusenko broach the sovereignty issue and the results of the referendum.

Deputy Blokhin says that the legislature and Government of Russia are not trying to supersede Union authorities, and that the center's policy of divide and rule is a dangerous one.

An unidentified deputy continues the debate; Deputies Dmitriyev, Kornilova, and Ber talk on the theme of the revival of Russia and the route to sovereignty.

Mikitayev takes the floor to speak about the need to sign the federative treaty.

At 2053 GMT the recording of the evening session, chaired by Khasbulatov, begins. Deputy Syrovatko speaks on the need to prevent segmentation of the Russian Federation. Khasbulatov invites Deputy Aksyutich to the rostrum, who speaks on the results of the referendum. Abdulatipov then takes the floor and says the ethnic question is becoming ever more an object of speculation: I think that our peoples are united by their living together. There are good and bad things in their lives, he says. Abdulatipov goes on to talk about the problems of working on the federative treaty. Certain extremist elements in autonomous republics are against the federative treaty, hoping that they will be able to secede from Russia, he says. In fact there is no such thing as pure sovereignty, he says—we must move toward concord and toward signing the treaty. I think that as far as the ethnic question, our democrats remain conservatives, he says. I propose to make a decision on the federative treaty, to decide on the sovereignty of our republics. Our republics must remain subjects of the federation, and must be given freedom. This will strengthen their sovereignty, says Abdulatipov. After signing a federative treaty, the Supreme Soviet must draw up a law on the federation. Special attention must be given to the rights of small peoples. A law must be taken enhancing the status of the subjects of the federation.

Deputy Shakhray takes the floor. The published draft of the Union treaty contains several articles permitting republics to be members of the USSR whether or not they are members of the RSFSR, he says—I believe that the dissolution of the RSFSR in the USSR can lead to nothing good. Nothing can justify the collapse of the RSFSR, he says.

A deputy from Yakutiya complains that Yakutiya needs more economic freedom.

Yeltsin reads out his greeting to the church, and asks the deputies to vote on whether it can be sent in the form drafted. The greeting is passed.

Deputy Gubitov speaks on the delimitation of powers between the RSFSR and the subjects of the federation. Yeltsin suggests a discussion of the appointment of the RSFSR procurator general, Valentin Georgiyevich Stepankov.

Stepankov takes the floor and speaks of the nature of work at the procurator's office. The procuracy, he says, should not meddle in economic and administrative affairs. The Russian Procuracy will stand guard for democracy, and will be tough on those who cause ethnic disorder, he promises. Above all, he says, it will act in the interests of Russia. Yeltsin asks for a vote on Stepankov's confirmation. It is passed.

At 2156 GMT Yeltsin asks for a vote on whether to pass the decision on the referendum as a basis. It is passed.

Deputy Shakray expresses concern about procedural matters. He says there is no need for the extra decision. Deputy Medvedev of the drafting commission says that two decisions had been planned. Deputy Golovnin, also for the drafting commission, says that two documents were prepared.

Deputy Abdulatipov says the congress has no right to combine the two documents. He says the documents should be adopted as a basis and sent on to the Supreme Soviet. Yeltsin proposes a vote to end discussion, and it is passed. Yeltsin says the exchange of views shows how difficult the issue of the national-state structure is.

Yeltsin then proposes a vote on a motion that the draft decision on Union treaty be adopted as a whole and conveyed to the Supreme Soviet. The motion is passed. Yeltsin proposes a vote on the draft decision on the main principles of the national-state structure and federal treaty, also to be sent on to Supreme Soviet; which is passed. The declaration drafted by the congress commission is also passed.

Yeltsin raises the draft decision on internal affairs bodies in connection with the deputies' hunger strike. A deputy suggests an amendment to the document. A vote on whether to put on the agenda the draft decision as a whole is not passed. A deputy complains the motion was unclear. A second vote is taken which also fails to pass. A new motion is made asking the Supreme Soviet to consider the matter and the hunger strikers to end their protest. Due to a lack of a quorum, Yeltsin withdraws the motion.

A deputy says that the decision was made on South Ossetia but there is dissatisfaction with point 6, and the words political methods should be added to this point. A vote is taken—no quorum. Another deputy comes to the rostrum and says that the people of Ossetia were enthusiastic about the original decision and asks for no changes to be made to it today.

Deputy Stepashin says the congress has seen criticism of President Gorbachev from left and right. Four political groups have drafted a statement, which he reads out, saying they reject calls for the ousting of Gorbachev. They propose that Gorbachev open talks with a view to creating a coalition government.

Yeltsin brings up the 5-percent sales tax. A deputy proposes that the 5-percent retail sales tax be voted out by congress. Deputy Kachanov gives background to the sales tax and says there is a danger the proposed move will penalize consumer goods manufacturers.

Silayev says that deputies have a list of goods exempt from the five percent tax. A point in the document needs to be rectified, he notes, and asks for comments about further categories of goods. Yeltsin says the Council of Ministers is to be asked to do further work on the list.

Deputy Basin of the congress Secretariat gives some statistics about the number of deputies who wanted to speak during the congress, the number of speeches, letters to the Congress, topics raised by deputies, what went wrong, and what went well. Yeltsin asks him to finish and Basin ends by thanking everyone.

Yeltsin comes to the rostrum and begins his closing speech. Following the speech, many deputies rise, applauding, and Yeltsin declares the congress over. All rise for the Russian national anthem.

Prepares 'Commonwealth' Treaty

LD0504143491 Moscow in TASS in English 1314 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lev Askyonov]

[Text] Moscow April 5 TASS—After granting Boris Yeltsin additional power to pull Russia out of the crisis, the extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation switched over to the discussion of the draft federal and Union treaties, as well as the results of the Russian referendum.

The congress editorial commission moved to adopt both drafts as the basis for further discussion and to recommend the Russian parliament to continue work on them. It also moved to reaffirm on behalf of the congress Russia's readiness to sign shortly the new Union treaty.

The motion was supported by most speakers during the afternoon sitting. They also agreed that the Russian Federation should be preserved as a single state. They criticised in this context the draft Union treaty which regards former autonomous republics as subjects of the Union. Tataria, Bashkiria, Yakutia and some other autonomous republics of the Russian Federation have recently declared themselves union republics and plan to sign the Union treaty independently.

It is worth noting the speech delivered by Deputy Vladimir Lysenko. He said that parliament members from several republics, representing new political parties, have drawn up their own draft treaty, envisaging the creation of a commonwealth of sovereign states instead of the Union. He moved to call a meeting on security and cooperation, attended by representatives of 15 Union republics, in order to decide the future of the USSR.

The discussion of this problem will be continued at the evening meeting.

Yeltsin proposed to work two extra hours in order to complete the congress today.

Goryacheva, Isayev To Remain

LD0504141591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1329 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrov]

[Text] Moscow, 5 Apr (TASS)—Boris Yeltsin's political opponents in the Russian parliamentary leadership do not intend to resign, in spite of the political victory won by him today when the majority of deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies voted in favor of granting him additional powers.

At a news conference at the congress press center, two out of the "Group of Six" who sharply criticized Boris Yeltsin's course and who tried to get the extraordinary congress convened—Svetlana Goryacheva and Boris Isayev—let it be clearly understood that they intend to continue their work in parliament as deputy chairmen of the parliament, despite the fact that they continue to disagree with Boris Yeltsin's political positions. In her address yesterday at the congress, Svetlana Goryacheva even stated that Boris Yeltsin does not possess such qualities as "honor and dignity."

In Svetlana Goryacheva's view, the opposition which has arisen in the leadership of Russia's parliament, which she called "a diversity of views," "can help to better resolve existing problems." "We will continue to work with Boris Yeltsin," Boris Isayev added.

Replying to journalists' questions, Svetlana Goryacheva refuted rumors that she intends to put forward her candidacy for the forthcoming RSFSR presidential elections.

Both representatives of the "Six" expressed the unanimous view that the present congress "has succeeded." "We are satisfied with the congress as it has passed off in an atmosphere of greater sincerity than the previous ones," Boris Isayev stated.

Yeltsin Gives Closing Speech

LD0504204191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1833 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Speech by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, at the closing session of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies in Moscow on 5 April—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed people's deputies: We are completing the third extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies. We succeeded in bringing it to an end and in adopting important decisions. Nevertheless, we think that the discussion of very important issues of Russia's life could have been more constructive. Unfortunately, an intensive search for a way out of this very hard situation became, now and then, a petty game of passion and group struggle. I hope that deputies understood that there won't be any winners in the struggle of political groups against the background of deepening economic crisis. I would like all of us to learn this lesson.

In order to lead Russia and the country out of the crisis, we need certain political conditions. Deputies adopted a decision on the redestribution of powers between supreme bodies of power in the RSFSR. Hence, they laid the foundations for the mechanism of the implementation of anticrisis measures in the Russian Federation and the execution of the congress decisions. We have a very great responsibility for the destiny of the people and for the implementation of very complicated reforms, given a peaceful development of events.

At this time, which is very hard for the people, the way out of the crisis can be ensured only by specific work of the whole deputies' corps, of the government, and of leaders at all levels. Despite the difference of opinions, the will for a constructive dialogue became manifest at the congress, as did the desire to ensure society's stability. The formation of a new group of deputies—Communists for Democracy—and the call by People's Deputy Polozkov for dialogue have also proved it.

I share your alarm at relations between Russia and the center that was heard in deputies' speeches. The USSR president and the Union leadership should know that any disagreements, however acute they may be, will not impede businesslike cooperation between the Union and the Russian leadership. [applause] A determined advance toward normal market economy and toward the strengthening of Russia's sovereignty should form the basis of this cooperation. The Russian economy depends on the center to a very large extent. Its disintegration, which can be seen in basic industries subordinated to the Union, has begun to threaten the very existence of the Russian sector of the national economy. That is why it is necessary to embark upon the path of reforms without any delay. Appeals, persuasion, or orders of any kind will not make people work better. I am convinced that only new economic relations and new incentives will increase both labor productivity and discipline.

The congress adopted the program of measures submitted to it for getting out of the crisis. Its basic directions are the stabilization of finances—first and foremost by a regime of strict economies with budgetary funds; the stimulation of entrepreneurial activity by means of flexible taxation; land reform and the creation of a variety of forms of ownership in agriculture, in fulfillment of the decisions of the extraordinary second Congress of People's Deputies on agrarian issues; privatization of entreprises by stages in all industries; the liberalization of prices and transition to free prices; the creation of a market in raw and processed materials and machinery, a securities market, and a labor market; the attraction of foreign investment; and the social protection of the population.

Life is far more complex than any scheme. New trends and problems will emerge, and all of this will require flexible reactions. In this context, we will always be formulating fresh current tasks of the day. It remains only to be regretted that most of the important proposals submitted for discussion by you have in practice been left untouched, although they could have been substantially augmented and enriched in the resolution on the report.

Now, to speak briefly about issues that were raised during the debates and addressed to the chairman of the Republic's Supreme Soviet, among others. Requests have been made for information on the work of the emergency commission on food. It has been working for three months and is examining the most acute, truly emergency problems. Among these there is the food resources of territories and regions, supplies of food to particularly large industrial regions, the supply of food to Moscow and Leningrad, stabilization of the work of enterprises in the food industry, discipline of supplies to Union and republic stocks, and resources of grain and other foodstuffs. Relevant instructions have been issued on the questions discussed, and decisions are being adopted that make it possible to reduce the acuteness of the situation and to maneuver food resources as well as rendering extra assistance to a number of regions of the republic.

Taking part in the work of the commission are leaders of the ministries, of the local soviets, and of the Russian Council of Ministers, all in constant interaction with the Union bodies. As for the procurement of imported grain, let me say this: Under the conditions of the economic agreement with the center, this year the republic is to receive 15 million tonnes of imported grain. This is under an agreement that has been signed. It's not charity. The foreign currency for it was earned by the people of Russia at their enterprises on the territory of the Republic. [applause] The deliveries are being effected very irregularly indeed. The Government of Russia, for its part, is doing all in its power to ease the situation, though what it can do is limited. I think the powers given to the Supreme Soviet and to the Government of Russia will make it possible to work more fruitfully in this direction. The difficult food situation this winter has demanded that we act decisively and put the emphasis on operational measures, and I consider that this is right. As long as a food crisis exists, the commission will act above all along these lines.

At the same time, it is already becoming necessary to tackle larger problems. The food commission has the potential, and the best options for its future work have been thought out. When the need arose for constant contact and monitoring of fulfilment of the legislature's decisions in the localities, the suggestion was made in the emergency food commission that authorized representatives of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia should be in the localities. This proposal is enshrined, by the way, in a clause [polozheniye] of the emergency commission. But these are people's deputies from those particular territories proposed by the oblast and other deputies' groups. They will be a connecting link between the Supreme Soviet, its committees and commissions, and the local authorities, and they will help Russia's laws into effect. They have been given powers within the framework of the law on the status of USSR people's deputies.

I reject categorically the accusations that have been made about so-called imperial manners. The position of the leadership of the Russian Federation with regard to the republics has not changed; I answer to all those who spoke otherwise here. At the meeting with representatives of the republics of Russia we confirmed this once again. Only one thing was condemned decisively: The nationalities question and the problem of sovereignties cannot be used in a dishonorable political struggle. I think that the proposal on the coordination of lawmaking activity between the republics and on a more precise distribution of powers, which was made in the report, are worthy of attention. Nor can I fail to mention the fate of the peoples of Russia who were subjected to repressions and deportation. Our opinion is unambiguous. Justice must triumph, and a number of steps have already been taken in this direction. The relevant law has successfully had its first reading and will be adopted finally at the sitting of the Supreme Soviet, which begins its work on 18 April. I think that the Supreme Soviet should not delay further work on this draft. After all, it is a matter of restoring the rights of millions of people.

Regarding the federation treaty, a distinctive feature of the Russian Federation is that it is made up of numerous national-state autonomous formations and dozens of oblasts and krays. It is vitally necessary to achieve harmony in their relations and to enshrine the fundamental principles relating to the existence of the federation in an appropriate treaty, and I think that we acted rightly today in adopting such a well-balanced document as the basis for appropriate instructions to the Supreme Soviet.

A few words about the Union treaty. Favoring a Union revitalized in its essence, we take a serious attitude toward its preparation. We are coordinating this work with the republics and, above all, with those with which we have treaties. Our positions on the main issues coincide. The approach is as follows: The new Union will be an association of sovereign states, moreover, of those states who have voluntarily expressed themselves in favor of joining it. The treaty must be as clear as possible and free of ambiguity. Work on it must proceed intensively without any fanning of passions on this issue. Let us stop intimidating people with the chaos that will, it is claimed, inevitably come about if the treaty is not signed simply immediately. I am confident that it will definitely be signed, but it will not be because the republics are forced into it but because a striving to live together accords with their interests. [applause]

Let me say something about certain aspects of the Supreme Soviet's work. In order to arrange the activities of committees and commissions, 227 staff were taken on at the request of these committees and commissions themselves. There has been no other increase in the number of staff employed by the Supreme Soviet. As regards pay increases paid to RSFSR people's deputies, who are employed on a permanent basis by the Supreme Soviet, I can say the following: On several occasions people's deputies raised the question of them being paid salaries equivalent to what they were paid before being taken into permanent employment by the Supreme Soviet. Proposals have been prepared, but they have not yet been studied. But people are already trying to exploit this question.

I confirm the figure I have already given you on the budget of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet—27 million rubles [R] for 1991—and also all the figures given in my report. All of the figures have been taken from official sources.

I go on to the higher consultative coordinating council. At this difficult time I consider it especially necessary for authoritative and clever specialists to take part in the drawing up of legislative decisions. Policies devoid of scientific foundations have led us into an impasse. Today's arrogance toward scientists is quite simply intolerable. [applause] As chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, I am entitled to have a consultative council staffed by volunteers. This is not a constitutional question. It does not require a decision either by the Supreme Soviet or by the congress. Attached to the council is a working group of experts. This is also legal. Total spending on its upkeep came to R48,812.39 in 1990-1991, not R2,000,000 as people's deputies alleged here. [applause]

I decisively reject the unsubstantiated accusations that have been leveled against me. May they rest on the conscience of those who made them. Let me say a few words about the notorious 140,000 million [rubles]. I can yet again assure all people's deputies that I myself had nothing to do with this business. There is nothing with which I can be reproached. I am just as confident that Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers, also had nothing to do with it. Of course, Filshin, as deputy chairman, handled this matter in a superficial and unprofessional way, I would say. He did not check thoroughly to find out what was going on. But there was no evil intent in this. The Supreme Soviet commission carried out a painstaking investigation and adopted a corresponding decision. We must, of course, bring this decision to the attention of every people's deputy, and then of course there would be no questions. Naturally we will bear this in mind in future.

It is an abnormal situation when people's deputies receive all information of this sort from the newspapers or the programs of central television.

There is another question that I would like to dwell upon. Pronouncements directed at me personally were voiced throughout the entire congress from the very first day from the rostrum, the microphone, and the auditorium. I value the support expressed in the statements, and I thank you for the constructive criticism, even if it was expressed somewhat sharply. I will try without fail to take account of all that in my work.

But there was not just that. There was also unethical attacks. And things went as far as outright insults. To sit for four days under often unjust criticism and simply insults from people's deputies is not easy. It seems to me that this is not admissible either. Sometimes one got the impression that quite a bit of time was spent thinking about how the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet could be wounded as badly as possible, struck as hard as possible.

In connection with this, I would like to express my opinion about the authors, about the six authors of the political statement. Yes, of course, various opinions were addressed toward them here, too. And of course, their statement pained me, and all the more so, since I was absent. But I think that this is not the time for us to shake up cadres. [applause] I will do everything to normalize work with the six people's deputies, including with three members of the presidium and two deputy chairmen of the Supreme Soviet. But for my part, I also want to warn that I will not permit various political games. [applause]

The duties of every deputy [chairman] and of every member of the presidium will certainly be defined more precisely, and strict requirements will be laid on each of them. And they will also be accountable to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet [applause] And I know how to lay down requirements! [laughter and applause]

I want to say, so that it can be known to everyone—to deputies and to electors, to supporters and to opponents—that I will never make any concessions which require that the interests of Russia or of its peoples be sacrificed, and I will not be demoralized. [applause]

I am firmly committed to the decisions of the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, and I will implement the line of strengthening the state sovereignty of the republic.

I want to repeat yet again from this rostrum: Despite whatever might happen, I shall not turn from the chosen course, neither today nor tomorrow. I state firmly: As long as there is trust and support I shall work for the good of Russia, and let no one have the slightest doubt on this score.

For my own part, I appeal to the citizens of Russia and to the people's deputies: In these difficult days we all need to know and believe that we have sufficient strength to come through the tough tests that have fallen to the lot of our homeland. If we act together we shall be able to realize the decisions that have been made and emerge from the crisis.

Thank you. [applause]

Russian Communists Assess Outcome

LD0604103191 Moscow TASS International Service in russian 1805 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Sergey Novozhilov and Ruben Shirinyan]

[Text] Moscow, 5 Apr (TASS)—Representatives of the Communists of Russia group of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies have stated that "it is impossible to give an unequivocal assessment of the extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies being held in Moscow". Igor Bratishchev, cochairman of the group, and deputy Nina Solodyakova today spoke at a news conference devoted to the preliminary congress results.

"Our task at the congress was to move away from fruitless political discussions and to engage in elaborating a specific program to stabilize the republic's economy", Igor Bratishchev said.

Commenting on the debate at the congress over the granting of emergency powers to Boris Yeltsin, I. Bratishchev noted that members of the Communists of Russia group held differing attitudes toward the issue. "I personally voted against because I consider that this means a departure from democracy, the more so since the range of emergency powers is not specifically stipulated".

In the view of Gennadiy Zyuganov, secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, who addressed the news conference, "Russia's leadership has many powers even without this, while the local authorities have practically none".

The participants at the news conference stated that at the upcoming Russian presidential elections on 12 June the RSFSR Communist Party may put forward its own candidate.

The news conference was held at a time when the extraordinary congress was still continuing. In the view of the deputies it will end late this evening.

Yeltsin Calls Work 'Constructive'

LD0504205991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2011 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Boriz Zverev and Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow, 5 April (TASS)—Speaking at a news conference on the results of the extraordinary Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, People's Deputies, which finished this evening, RSFSR Chairman Boris Yeltsin described the work of the forum as "constructive." He also stated, however, that it could have made more constructive decisions. He expressed doubt in the expediency of convening the congress, noting that one could have waited until the regular congress, previously planned for May.

Giving his assessment of the balance of political forces at the forum, Yeltsin stated that despite pronouncements by a number of deputies demanding his resignation, he "had not displayed cowardice" and, perceiving the trust of the majority of deputies, had declined such a step.

The head of the legislature recalled his proposal on holding a "roundtable" of the country's leading political forces and expressed regret that this proposal "had remained unnoticed" at the congress. He also advocated a continuation of serious work on the union and federation treaties, noting that this problem should be tackled with the participation of "every republic and every oblast and kray."

In connection with the USSR president's visit to Japan, which is set for April, Boris Yeltsin repeated the position of the Russian leadership on the so-called "northern territories" issue. In Boris Yeltsin's words, this issue comes down to the claim that a representative of the RSFSR should be included in the group preparing the visit (?and) in the delegation. If decisions affecting the interests of the RSFSR are taken without these conditions being met, Yeltsin said, then the republic's leadership will "regard such agreements as invalid."

'Text' of Congress Resolution

LD0604113191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2128 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 5 Apr (TASS)—Following is the text of the resolution of the Third Extraordinary Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies on the redistribution of powers between the RSFSR highest state bodies for implementing anti-crisis measures and decisions made by the congresses of RSFSR people's deputies.

In order to provide conditions for implementing decisions made by Congresses of RSFSR People's Deputies, for overcoming the economic crisis, for solving socioeconomic problems, for preserving civic peace, for implementing decisions of the Second (Extraordinary) Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies on agricultural issues, for restoring public order, for solving and preventing social conflicts, to provide social protection of citizens, and to strengthen inter-ethnic cooperation, the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies resolves:

1. To instruct the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR Council of Ministers, the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers to implement urgent measures for bringing society out of the crisis situation, protecting the economic basis of

RSFSR sovereignty, facilitating the transfer to a market economy, strengthening management and law and order systems, preventing, suspending, and stopping strikes, strengthening the guarantees of implementing the rights and freedoms of citizens, and endowing the aforementioned bodies with necessary powers within the framework of the existing RSFSR Constitution.

In the process of implementing anti-crisis powers:

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet has a right to issue laws on matters within the competence of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies (apart from the adoption of the RSFSR Constitution) through the presentation of these laws to the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies for approval;

The chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers have a right to issue instructions, within the framework of RSFSR legislation, which will be mandatory for implementation on RSFSR territory.

Decisions by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, envisaging the introduction of emergency measures on specific territories of the Russian Federation, are made in coordination with the highest bodies of state power of the republics which are members of the RSFSR, and with soviets of people's deputies of krays, oblasts, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs.

Emergency measures cannot encroach upon the activity, powers, and competence of the legal authorities at all levels.

2. The powers of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and the Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet envisaged in Article 1 of the present resolution cannot be used to dissolve any legally elected bodies of state power, change the national-state structure of the RSFSR, social and state system of the RSFSR, to reach decisions on questions of changing RSFSR frontiers with other Union republics, and to elect the constitutional court of the RSFSR.

The Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies has a right to change or cancel any decision made by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and also the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

3. To hold the next RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies on 21 May 1991.

To define the date for the RSFSR presidential election on 12 June 1991.

4. The present resolution comes into force from the moment of its adoption and is valid until the RSFSR president comes into power.

Yeltsin 5 Apr News Conference

LD0604123591 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2337 GMT 5 Apr 91

[News conference by Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, President Boris Yeltsin in Moscow on 5 April, following the close of the Extraordinary Third Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies—recorded]

[Text] [Yeltsin] The third extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies had not been planned, but in accordance with our rules, following a demand by 250 of 1068 people's deputies, they were entitled to demand that the congress be convened. This came mainly from a group of Russian Communists and, to a small extent, from representatives of other groups. There have been plans for a report by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet chairman for nine months, on why the country was wrecked over 73 years and six months, why the situation deteriorated for six years, and why this situation was not corrected over nine months. The report was to draw conclusions and remove the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman and the Council of Ministers chairman, thereby beheading Russia's parliament, which persistently follows a radical road, a road of reform, including a serious and strong fight against the center, in order to defend Russian sovereignty.

They failed to carry it out, according to this planned scenario. The congress proceeded fairly constructively. On the first issue, I delivered a report on the sociopolitical situation in the Russian Federation and measures for coming out of the crisis. There were many interesting speeches, although, of course, considering that many were inclined only at a critical tilt, there could have been more constructive speeches and proposals. But still, the decision is fairly wide, it covers all aspects of life in our Russian Federation, a specific mechanism for coming out of the crisis, and it approved the program of action, a program presented by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers. There were frequent proposals for resignation in the speeches, but I have not shown cowardice, because I can see the trust that is being shown in me. That is why I clenched my teeth and my heart. I did not offer my resignation, which was what some people very much wanted.

But, in order to implement such a decision, in order to get out of this critical situation, we had to redistribute the functions and powers of the bodies of state power, the Congress of People's Deputies, the Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Supreme Soviet chairman, as well as of the Council of Ministers and the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. Having cast aside, in order to give greater powers to the Supreme Soviet and the Presidium and the chairman of the Council of Ministers, we freed the congress from some specific issues, to avoid convening extraordinary congresses twice a month in such critical period. The situation required this. Such a severe decision required it. I did not want to be taken hostage by this decision, which made it possible to convene a congress again in a month's time on the initiative of 250 deputies, and to say that the decision is not being executed and to start firing people. These proposals were adopted with difficulty. Such a redistribution of functions was adopted by the decision.

Now the Supreme Soviet, its leadership, and the Council of Ministers of its leadership, will act faster and more decisively to overcome the crisis and to implement reforms. We discussed issues concerning the Union and federative treaties, as well as the results of the referendum. Decisions were adopted on the first reading to form the basis, because this issue is so subtle that we cannot deal with it at such quorum. We have to deal with each republic, with each oblast and kray. Because Russia comprises 100 nations and ethnic groups, and 88 ethnic and administrative-territorial formations. But decisions were adopted as a basis. It was made incumbent upon the Supreme Soviet and other bodies to bring them to top condition, as they say, and to the moment of signing the federative and Union treaties.

We have actually confirmed an RSFSR Procurator General. This happened in the Russian Federation for the first time. That is why when I was saying our procurator general, I did not mean that of the Yeltsin family. No, I meant that for the first time in history he was not appointed by the procurator general of the Union, but he was appointed by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and finally confirmed by the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. I say this once again: It means that he is our procurator general.

There are various, different, questions about the miners' strike movement, and questions on South Osettia and a number of others. Conclusions can be drawn that despite, say, my initially skeptical attitude toward holding an extraordinary congress so quickly, one could have waited for the routine May Congress of People's Deputies. Now the decision is to hold the next congress on 21 May, and on 12 June to hold elections for the president of the Russian Federation. That is all.

Your question?

[Moderator] Boris Nikolayevich, before my colleagues begin to ask you questions, we want to supply you with information. Here, at our congress, 2,306 journalists were accredited. Most worked every day with you, together with the congress. This is for your information.

Now, esteemed colleagues, let's have your questions. Boris Nikolayevich asked that we finish our news conference in 40 minutes. Please ask specific and quick questions. Go ahead, young man.

[Correspondent] Are you afraid that, having taken such powers now, the center is handing to you certain responsibilities for the situation, which is so difficult in your country now?

[Yeltsin] Is is better not to take on responsibility. That is always easier.

[Correspondent] AMURSKIY KURIER. Esteemed future president of the Russian Federation, I want...[changes thought] Of course, it is perhaps not the time to introduce discord here, but, on 28 March, we experienced a very awful day. Therefore, I want to ask you to give your personal assessment of what happened in the capital of our homeland on the 28th, at the opening of this congress. Very briefly.

[Yelstin] You know the president's decree and the decision of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers regarding the measures, allegedly to protect people's deputies from the Muscovites. Of course, this is unconvincing and unfounded. Troops and subunits of the Internal Affairs Ministry and the KGB had been assembled in order not to allow the demonstration, the demonstrators, on this day, either at Manezhnaya Square or Red Square. On the whole, measures were taken to protect the Kremlin itself, not the people's deputies of the Russian Federation, unconstitutional measures. That is why the congress evaluated them as such. These were unconstitutional measures. They demanded that the president take measures immediately to remove the vehicles, the military subunits. Only after this, the congress would continue its work.

The congress interrupted its work. Only the following morning, when the vehicles had indeed left, at least from sight, did the congress continue its work.

[Correspondent] The Russian News Agency. Boris Nikolayevich, you have spoken in favor of holding a roundtable. Today, you said you are prepared to start a dialogue with the center. Do you intend in the near future to come forward with an initiative for starting a dialogue with President Gorbachev and the Union government?

[Yeltsin] I regret that the congress did not note this proposal in the report and did not adopt a corresponding resolution. I was prepared today, before my concluding speech, to make a statement again, a statement on the organization of a roundtable, on creating a situation of civil peace and national concord, so that Gorbachev, Yeltsin, and the chairmen and presidents of other Union republics, and the leaders of various parties, movements, workers' movements and strike movements, could sit down at a roundtable in order to achieve peace and concord. Although such a resolution was not adopted, I did not make such a statement, I thought it would be superfluous to make several statements at the congress. But I will continue to bring this idea into reality.

[Correspondent] SAMARSKAYA GAZETA. Tell us please, Boris Nikolayevich, do you know of any signs of interest from the USSR president and the leadership of the Communist Party on the idea of a roundtable? If they are not prepared to particpate in it, what will you do?

[Yeltsin] Tomorrow, it will be necessary to examine the printout of the voting, who voted against a roundtable. Because the draft resolution contained a clear point: To approve this proposal and accordingly oblige the Supreme Soviet in organizing this roundtable. But this point was blocked. I can make a guess who did it, but it is still necessary to check the printout of the electronic system.

[Correspondent] Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS. Now that you have received these new powers from the Russian legisaltors, do you consider it possible, in whatever form, to address the miners? Today the fate of our economy is being decided there, as well as our fate. Can you say anything about this, or do you have nothing prepared in this respect as yet? Go ahead, please.

[Yeltsin] We have agreed today with representatives of the miners' collectives, first in accordance with the congress decision on the strike movement adopted by us, to set up an interlegislative commission to examine all issues, not only economic and political, sinice the meeting with Union Prime Minister Pavlov led to three more mines closing, and motor enterprises and a number of other enterprises stopping work.

We have agreed that our Russian Presidium will approve this legisaltive group. We are sending our decisions to other republics, as well to the president and the Cabinet of Ministers, to organize this interlegislative commission to resolve all these issues. I think it will be a more constructive step, not just an appeal. But, if we need an appeal, if the situation becomes excited, if the consequences become really harsh, I will contact striking collectives directly in order to discuss this issue. If they are going to react to this I will definitely appeal to them.

[Correspondent] Thank you, KROKODIL magazine. Despite your appeal for the Presidium's consolidation, it will evidently be difficult for you to work with two deputies. How are you planning to adjust your work in this regard?

[Yeltsin] The first thing is not to make any more allowances for their period of adaptation. I indulged in thinking that they still had their period of adaptation and did not require the execution of their functions, as I could have done. We will be building our work and taking account of the clear division of duties and clear requirements concerning the execution of functions. If they are able to prove themselves by their work, not by political games to disrupt the normal work of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and unsettling myself, then I will do my best not to keep anger in my heart. I think our main shortfall is the shortage of kindness.

[Correspondent] Vyacheslav Dolganov of ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA. Boris Nikolayevich, at a meeting of the special food commission it emerged that certain krays and oblasts, in particular Krasnodar kray, which is perpetrating purely political games, are not supplying food and are quite simply infringing in an elementary way, even on planned deliveries. To put it bluntly, how do the Supreme Soviet and its leadership intend in the present situation to combat this sabotage?

[Yeltsin] If appeals for good sense in showing discipline and order fail to have an effect, the procuracy will be instructed to employ its methods. There is also a procedure in this regard. If it is proposed to level an accusation against the chairman of a kray or oblast soviet or, say, even a first secretary, of aiding, of directly aiding, the nonfulfilment of these deliveries, the question of no confidence in him is raised at the session of the kray or oblast soviet. If the session does not make this decision, the procurator applies to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, which adopts a corresponding decision. True, there is but one in this respect. As a rule, in those regions that are not delivering, the posts of chairmen are combined with those of first secretaries, and the first secretaries are USSR people's deputies. In order to make them answerable in this way, one needs a decision by the USSR Supreme Soviet. You can see how circular things are. So, not everything is easy, but I think that, after a president of the Russian Federation is elected and a law is passed on local soviets and local self-government, all chairmen of soviets at absolutely every level will be up for election by the people, literally in the months of June and July, and then the people will make their choice.

[Correspondents] The Japanese KYODO TSUSHIN agency. One question in connection with the visit to Japan by the president of the Soviet Union. Boris Nikolayevich, would you once again explain your position on the territorial issue with Japan? In particular, do you intend to have a meeting with the USSR president prior to his visit in order to reach agreement on this problem?

[Yeltsin] I have repeatedly spoken about this problem, both in Japan and here. I think there is now no need to repeat all five points about which I have spoken. My position has not changed all along. I have expressed this position to the president. In addition, I have said in a personal coversation with the president that I am setting a few conditions in respect to his visit to Japan. The first is that representatives of the Russian Federation, from either the Supreme Soviet or the Foreign Ministry, participate in the working group. The second is that the delegation includes a senior representative of the Russian Federation. At present, the candidate being discussed does not entirely suit us. I have made a protest about this, having in mind a different candidate. Further, if decisions are made—I have also stated this and it will be stated in writing both to the country's president and also Kaifu, Japan's prime minister—if decisions affecting the territorial or other interests of the Russian Federation are adopted without our knowledge, we shall regard such decisions as invalid.

[Correspondent] KURANTY newspaper. Boris Nikolayevich, did you send Mikhail Sergeyevich an invitation to the congress? Why do you think it was that he was somewhere completely different, at the conference of military party workers?

[Yeltsin] You see, it is the president's own choice where he goes. It has never been a tradition for the Russian congress to send an invitation. His presidential flag is in its place, and this flag awaited the president throughout the nine days. In addition, a group of people's deputies from the new Communists for Democracy group consulted with me and went off to see him today to invite him to the congress. But it seems that perhaps time had been lost. It was evening. There was of course a state of weariness at the congress, if I can put it that way. In a word, the president did not come to the congress. I did not personally have any discussions with him about this since I was chairing the congress at that very time. So the special group went off, but it said that, well (?and this included him, too).

[Correspondent] Bryansk television. During the resolution, sorry, during the discussion of the draft agenda, Deputy Lodkin introduced an amendment on the impermissible slowness of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Republic in resolving Chernobyl issues. This amendment was approved by the majority of votes, but, according to the data of the roll-call voting, you voted against it. Please explain your stand. Thank you.

[Yeltsin] I cannot now recall what the reason was. We must see, first of all, whether that is really so. We must check your data. I certainly think that, essentially, and not judging from the formal point of view, a considerable slowness is being shown in resolving the Chernobyl issue, on the part of both the Supreme Soviet of Russia and the Council of Ministers.

[Correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich, VECHERNIY VOLGODONSKIY KURYER. In the report, insufficient attention was devoted to matters of the rehabilitation of the repressed peoples. What is this question coming up against? Is it coming up against the economic nature of the problems, or against political problems?

[Yeltsin] It is not coming up against anything now because we have adopted this law in the first reading. Now, the session will continue its work and will finally adopt it.

[Correspondent] I am Terekhov from INTERFAX. Boris Nikolayevich, after the decision was made to grant you extraordinary—increased—powers, many people were saying backstage at the congress that this was dictatorship. They were accusing you of that. Would you tell us please which of the powers that have been given to the Supreme Soviet under the redistribution will go to you personally, as chairman of the Supreme Soviet?

[Yeltsin] I am not even sure yet. [laughter] This is actually a redistribution of powers, not the granting of additional personal powers. For example, Gorbachev sought additional personal powers, and he got them at the Congress of People's Deputies. I was not seeking this. That was not the way I put the question. What I was seeking was a redistribution of powers so that the congress does not have to be convened every time, so that a number of congressional functions can be transferred to the Supreme Soviet, so that the Supreme Soviet can adopt a decision of law, so that some of the functions of the Supreme Soviet can be transferred to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, so that the Presidium can make decisions during recesses between Supreme Soviet sessions, so that a number of the Presidium's functions can be transferred to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, so that he can issue speedy instructions on these questions. But all this is in the framework of the Constitution. That is the most important thing. Therefore, it cannot lead in any way to any dictatorship. On the contrary, this is a democratic move, aimed at strictly fulfilling the existing Constitution and, better still, the new constitution which is to be adopted.

[Correspondent] RUSSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, Samara. Could you tell us, please, Boris Nikolayevich, do you not believe that we should add a war on decrees to the war on laws?

[Yeltsin] I said in the report, if you had the opportunity to listen to it, that there is no war of laws but that there is a war on laws. We should not wage war on laws. That is why there will not be any, there will not be any speculation at all about the war of laws. That is why the chairman, I mean the chairman of Russia's Supreme Soviet, has not been given the right to issue such decrees as the USSR president has been given, rather orders, orders as a rule of an urgent nature.

Of course, we will take measures. Now, I think that the center has already been taught, and we have been taught, that it is necessary to be occupied less with these matters, but to be occupied more with specific issues of the economy, of reforms, of legislative activity, and, of course, with questions of improving people's lives, because today the situation is simply catastrophic.

Among other things, today we passed, say, an amendment to the president's decree on the 5 percent tax. So, do we have a war on our hands again? This is not a war. This is an improvement of some legislative acts by the Russian legislature, or congress, in the name of the people of Russia.

When today we increased threefold the list of food on which a 5 percent sales tax is not to be levied, well then, is that a war of laws? No. It is a struggle for the people of Russia and an improvement of legislative practice. These laws and decrees need to be coordinated, to be coordinated.

[Correspondent] I am a reporter from the International Journalists' Center. Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, when you were asking for additional powers for the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, did you think that it would be very difficult to stabilize the situation in our country, in Russia, in such a short time, and that the inevitable drop in the living standards of Russians will be a blow to your standing on the very eve of the presidential elections?

[Yeltsin] The expectation in making this statement and request regarding the reallocation of powers was not that, as a result of this decision, the crisis we face would immediately, in a month or two, cease to exist. No. The idea was different, to tackle matters dealing with combatting the crisis more effectively and, perhaps, to prevent the most extreme manifestations of general civil disobedience on the territory of the Russian Federation, and a number of other problems. The idea was not that, if the decision came in, Russia would be delivered from its crisis solution.

You will recall that when Gorbachev was assuming powers for two years, it was said to be for the period during which the crisis was being overcome. There was no such condition here. The period was merely noted here—up to the presential elections—because the president would then have the relevant powers. All other state bodies would also have their powers to govern increased accordingly.

[Correspondent] Tatyana Bogachkova, Vladivostok Radio. Boris Nikolayevich, doubts have already been voiced at the congress about the chances of implementing the program to surmount the economic crisis that you have put forward. Certain members of your team also expressed no confidence in you. Desite this, you did assume responsibility in these circumstances, for the destiny of Russia, at least. What are the main conditions under which, in your view, it is possible to implement your program?

[Yeltsin] I was very clear in the political section of my report. It is a pity that this political section was not included in the decision. The econmic section said what demands have to be made of the Supreme Soviet, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers and the chairman of the Council of Ministers. It was all in there. As for the political conditions, I clearly listed them. One, two, three. Eight conditions in all. The congress did not, regrettably, adopt them in the decision. But I think some of them will be adopted by the Supreme Soviet, and some will be tackled as and when the need arises, in concert with Union bodies. That, of course, includes the realization of the idea of the roundtable. Only in an atmosphere of national accord can one achieve any sort of success in reform and improving peoples' lives.

[Correspondent] I represent AFP and EFE. My first question is this, Boris Nikolayevich: Four groups issued a statement today in defense of Gorbachev. To what extent do you think Gorbachev needed this statement? How timely was it? Is he really threatened with having to resign? Is there a danger of him being removed by the so-called right-wingers? Secondly, do you have any real agreement with the miners after today's meeting? Thank you.

[Yeltsin] You mean the threat of the country's president having to resign? Yes, a group of USSR People's deputies have gathered enough signatures to convene an extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies and to propose a motion calling for the resignation of the country's president. But a final decision on this congress has not yet been taken.

[Correspondent] The fact is that we know that the congress was initiated by Communists to seek your resignation. Ivan Pavlovich, in a subsequent interview, said that they would not demand a resignation. Do you think that this is a real change of attitude toward yourself, or a tactical move?

[Yeltsin] The fact is that, if you noticed it, about halfway through the congress's work there was a breakthrough, a breakthrough toward constructive work on the part of those who had set themselves this task. They saw that it was unrealistic, that they would not now succeed in removing Yeltsin at the Congress of People's Deputies, and that in order not to disgrace themselves but, on the contrary, to win points for themselves, it would be better to come out in his support.

[Correspondent] [Passage indistinct]

[Yeltsin] I think that land reform has begun. Yes, it is proceeding with some lack of progress, since there are leaders of oblasts, krays and republics—and this especially applies to places where the functions of chairmen of soviets are combined with those of first secretaries—who are quite simply sabotaging implementation of Russian Federation laws on land reform, although there are now no brakes in this respect on the part of the legislative body. That is to say, the Supreme Soviet has now passed everything necessary to give land to the people, those who want to cultivate it. Recently, I have on several occasions visited Yaroslavl, Novgorod and Kaliningrad oblasts to meet with tens and hundreds of thousands of people. I have been saying: Well, why have you only 10 peasant holdings in the oblast, while, say, in Volgograd oblast there are 500, and the intention is that in April indeed there will 1,000 while you have the very same laws? But, in Volgograd oblast the chairman of the oblast soviet is Makharadze, a democrat, and the soviet is itself democratic. They have been carrying out this land reform very persistently. Almost all the people who want to cultivate land, whether it is garden, an orchard or a peasant holding, are provided with the land during April. Persistence is necessary, but this redistribution of powers will assist us and will increase the persistence.

[Correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich, the SOBESEDNIK weekly. I have the following question. What is your attitude to Nikolay Travkin's proposal to hold real multiparty elections properly in December?

[Yeltsin] I think that most parties are not yet ready for that. It is a bit early yet. They have not yet got themselves together. If the democratic movement were now to set up a real, large-scale, people's legislative party, with 10 or 15 million members, which could form an alternative to the CPSU, then of course it would be realistic to talk of such a thing and move to such elections. But as long as there is one party with 15 million while the other has 20,000—well, the correlation of forces is of course too unequal. And then—there is no getting away from it, let us say it frankly—though in formal terms Article 6 may have been removed from the Cnstitution, the CPSU today remains the ruling party, with all its property, and power, and the KGB and the Army. Everything belongs to it.

[Correspondent] Vorkaleva, ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA. Boris Nikolayevich, what is your attitude to the results of the all-Army party conference and the new Army party structures set up there?

[Yeltsin] I am for departmentalization.

[Correspondent] Austrian radio and television. Don't you think that now, after this congress, the Romanian option is being discussed in the CPSU?

[Yeltsin] Today, as it happens, I met President Iliescu of Romania during a break. We had a very interesting conversation and the upshot was that we came to a general agreement that they are concluding a general, strategic, global treaty with the Union, and as for Russia, we are concluding an economic, trade, scientific, technical and cultural treaty between Romania and Russia. All the same, I don't think we shall have the Romanian option.

[Correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich, first the Vostok radio station welcomes you, and second it is worried about our children. Apart from Svetlana Goryacheva's speech, in which she spoke about her children, very little was devoted to children, for whom things will be very difficult now, starting with their school days. What is there in the program of the government and the Supreme Soviet chairman to protect our children today?

[Yeltsin] There is a special program which, admittedly, so far has not been approved. It is Russia's state youth program. Of course it includes children. But I am not going to unveil it. All in all, I tried to highlight these two subjects in the report—the subject of youth policy, state policy. Not just like we always usually have at Central Committee congresses, where they talk abut work with young people. No, about a state program and state policy for youth, Russian, of the Supreme Soviet and appropriately the government. The second subject was, you may have noted, creative intelligentsia, creative unions. It was culture, since without moving that we will not move anything. We shall not build a good home on our lack of culture.

[Correspondent] [Words indistinct] MOLAD UKRAINY daily. Boris Nikolayevich, as you know, your, the congress statement, on Osettia was received very equivocally in Georgia. How do you see the future development of Russian-Georgian relations against the background of this [words indistinct].

[Yeltsin] You know, first of all, there was a small inaccuracy there. So it was interpreted incorrectly, through political means. Then we clarified this with Gamsakhurdia. The mass media, too, were a little at fault there, having distorted the sense of the adopted decision, which was adopted precisely for the sake of consolidating the situation there. Then I was there and met Gamsakhurdia on the border of Georgia and Russia. I visited North Osettia. Questions were discussed in great detail. We signed with Gamsakhurdia a protocol on the basis of which we are going to act. I think that by this method precisely we shall try to make the situation stabilize.

I thank all the journalists for the work during the work of the ocngress, for today's questions, for the work. All the best to you. Good-bye.

'Redistribution of Powers' Resolution

PM0804154191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

[Resolution signed by B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet in Moscow on 5 April: "Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies Resolution on the Redistribution of Powers Among the RSFSR Supreme Organs of Power for the Implementation of Anticrisis Measures and the Fulfillment of Decisions by the RSFSR Congresses of People's Deputies"]

[Text] With a view to ensuring conditions for fulfilling the decisions by the Congresses of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies, overcoming the economic crisis, solving socioeconomic problems, maintaining civic peace, fulfilling the decisions by the Second (Extraordinary) Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies on agrarian questions, restoring public order, resolving and preventing social conflicts, ensuring citizens' social protection, and strengthening national cooperation, the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies resolves:

1. To instruct the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the RSFSR Council of Ministers, the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers to implement immediate measures for extricating society from the crisis situation; protecting the economic base of RSFSR sovereignty; ensuring transition to a market economy; strengthening the systems of management and law and order; preventing, halting, and terminating strikes; strengthening the guarantees enabling citizens to exercise their rights and freedoms; and to grant the aforementioned organs the necessary powers within the framework of the RSFSR Constitution currently in force.

In the process of exercising anticrisis powers:

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet is empowered to promulgate laws on questions within the powers of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies (except adopting an RSFSR Constitution), with subsequent submission of any such laws for ratification by the Congress of RSFSR People's deputies;

The chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers are empowered to promulgate ordinances within the framework of RSFSR legislation for mandatory execution throughout the RSFSR territory;

Decisions by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, envisaging the introduction of emergency measures in individual territories of the Russian Federation are adopted in agreement with the supreme organs of state power in the republics belonging to the RSFSR and with the kray, oblast, autonomous oblast, and autonomous okrug soviets of people's deputies.

Emergency measures cannot infringe on the activity, powers, or competence of judicial authorities at any level.

2. The powers of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet as envisaged in Article 1 of this Resolution cannot be exercised for the purpose of dissolving any legitimately elected organs of state power, amending the RSFSR's national-state structure or the RSFSR's social and state structure, resolving questions of changes to the RSFSR's borders with other union republics, or electing the RSFSR Constitutional Court.

The Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies is empowered to amend or repeal any decision adopted by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the RSFSR Council of Ministers, the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, or the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

3. A regular Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies is to be held 21 May 1991.

Elections of RSFSR President are to be held 12 June 1991.

4. This resolution comes into force from the moment of its adoption and will remain in force until the RSFSR president takes office.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Moscow, The Kremlin, 5 April 1991.

Official, Media Reaction to Congress Reported

'Failure' in Resolving Problems

LD0604081291 Moscow TASS in English 0059 GMT 6 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The results of the Extraordinary Third Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, which lasted for nine days and ended in the Kremlin on Friday, raised many problems. For instance: could Yeltsin's political victory be equal in the scope to the failure of the congress in resolving socioeconomic problems facing the largest of the Union republics?

It is worth recalling that the congress was convened on the demand of some 270 people's deputies, who are critical of Yeltsin's course. There was no doubt in anybody's mind that an attempt would be made at the congress to put Yeltsin in his place.

The developments at the congress took a different course, however. The alignment of forces did not permit Yeltsin's opponents to oust him. Moreover, the positions of Yeltsin and his supporters perceptibly consolidated as a result of the congress. A resolution on vesting him with additional authority close to that of a president to take Russia out of the crisis, for a period until the election of a president, was approved with a large margin: 607 votes for, 228 against and 100 abstentions. The date of the election was fixed: June 12.

And still it would be an exaggeration to say that Yeltsin has won a complete victory. For example, his opponents managed to block the proposal on the creation of a "coalition federal government of people's trust and national accord." The item of the resolution on Yeltsin's report, suggesting the departisation of law enforcement agencies and the state apparatus, was not supported either. At the same time, it is clear that the leader of the Russian parliament has gained in strength and will probably start building his relations with the Union leadership from new positions, using new authority granted to him by the congress.

The "Russia-centre rivalry was felt throughout the congress, beginning with the resolution, adopted on the first day, on cancelling the resolution on the Union leadership, which banned temporarily the holding of demonstrations in Moscow, and ending with the refusal to allow criminal proceedings against People's Deputy Artem Tarasov, who could have been accused of insulting the president.

Political struggle at the congress put to the background the key items of the agenda. There were no constructive proposals on the report of Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev, who set forth the economic programme of his cabinet. People's deputies almost did not discuss ways of saving the economy of the largest Union republic from the impending catastrophe. In the lobby many legislators said that "Yeltsin's opponents have been defeated, but Russia's sliding down towards an economic collapse has not been stopped."

Throughout the congress the opponents argued over the problem of executive presidency, which left only a day and a half for discussing two key items of the agenda—the federal and Union treaties. The legislators were very tired by that time.

Now that the heated arguments at the congress are over, the question arises: was it really necessary to convene it? One could or could not agree with the people's deputy who said that "people need bread and not a president." And still, electors had every reason to expect from their representatives a more interested discussion and an effective solution of crucial problems facing Russia.

Khasbulatov Sees Yeltsin 'Victory'

LD0604180691 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 6 Apr 91

[By Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—First Deputy Chairman of the Russian parliament Ruslan Khasbulatov described the results of the third extraordinary congress of Russian people's deputies as "a great personal victory for Boris Yeltsin." he answered questions from Soviet and foreign journalists at a news conference devoted to the results of the congress here today.

The congress was convened on the demand of 270 people's deputies, who criticise Yeltsin's policy, among them two deputy chairmen of the Russian Parliament and chairmen of both chambers of parliament.

Khasbulatov said that a clear economic programme, which was presented to the congress by Yeltsin, ensured victory to him.

Speaking about the implementation of economic reforms, khasbulatov stressed that they aimed, first and foremost, to free enterprises of excessive patronage, secure the inflow of foreign capital into the republic, elaborate the republic's customs policy and solve serious problems in agriculture.

According ot Khasbulatov, small business should become the main prop for reforms. "In handling all these issues, we are prepared to cooperate closely with the union leadership," Khasbulatov said.

On pit workers' strike movement, Khasbualtov said the Russian Government "is ready to assume responsibility for solving the social issues of the republic's miners." At the same time, he emphasised that it was very difficult to do it due to the lack of real economic power.

Yeltsin, Ministers Discuss Results

LD0604204291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1819 GMT 6 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr (TASS)—According to the press service of the Presidium of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, a meeting was held at the RSFSR House of Soviets today between RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman Boris Yeltsin and the leadership of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

The discussions were dominated by the decisions taken by the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, which has just ended. The participants in the meeting analyzed its results. They noted the importance of the decisions for the practical work being done by the Russian Government to stabilize the economic situation and to lead the Russian Federation out of the crisis.

Arrangements for further work on the anticrisis program and the drawing up of specific measures to implement it were decided on during the exchange of views. Particular attention was paid to pinpointing reserves from which the population can be supplied with food and consumer goods. Urgent anticrisis measures, intended first and foremost to protect the population from the consequences of the price increases, were discussed. Priority measures that the government needs to take to improve the administration of the RSFSR's economy were singled out.

It was noted at the meeting that increased responsibility and discipline, the shaping of effective structures, and the strengthening of ties with local bodies are the most important conditions for the successful activities of executive bodies.

The meeting discussed ways of strengthening contacts between the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Presidium of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, bearing in mind the congress's decision on the redistribution of powers. The policy of government bodies on strengthening ties between the republics, krays, and oblasts of the RSFSR and the need to implement the policy on interethnic relations adopted at the congress were reiterated.

The need to strenthen direct economic ties between the RSFSR and foreign partners was noted during the discussion on foreign political activities.

Further on 4 Apr Russian Congress Session

Silayev Addresses Deputies

LD0504143291 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2017 GMT 4 Apr 91

[Speech by Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Council of Ministers at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin on 4 April—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade People's Deputies. You all remember well the period when, in a complex situation, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet tried to adopt basic laws which would legally underpin the activity of executive bodies. Unfortunately, two laws were adopted.

I do not mean to blame or reproach anyone. This is, however, reality. I can imagine that a similar situation may arise—and I think that it will no doubt arise—in the subsequent work of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. This in the situation in which we will have to fulfill our pledges to you and your very serious and fair instructions, when we and the Supreme Soviet will have to fulfill a very complex, but a very correct, we believe, program you have endorsed for taking the country out of the crisis and the transfer to market relations.

In this respect, we will have to adopt very serious laws without which we naturally cannot implement the main provisions. We may therefore be deprived of an instrument for the implementation of this program which you have instructed us to revise, to submit to the Supreme Soviet, and to use as guidance. Consequently, taking into account a certain distribution of powers in the Supreme Soviet, I do not think that it is some sort of an extraordinary or extreme phenomenon.

This is reality. Situations can and will arise in which—bearing in mind the different positions, let us say, held by members of the Supreme Soviet—certain laws may not be adopted. This will create virtual deadlock. In such circumstances, when the balance of votes makes it impossible to adopt a final decision—and I speak as an interested party in an executive organ of power—it would be extremely important to have this power, to grant this power to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. It would be a temporary measure lasting, in practical terms, only a month. Alternatively, one could adopt decisions or introduce temporary documents which could be subsequently endorsed, if they are correct, or rescinded, if they are incorrect, by the Congress of People's Deputies.

That is why, speaking on my own behalf and on behalf of those members of the Presidium whom I have managed to consult, I advocate support of the way this question has been put. I would also like, if I may, to shed light on the first paragraph, clause one.

The wording here says: To instruct...[shouting from hall]. Excuse me, evidently, there was no point in my coming to the rostrum in that case—I would ask you to consider the following variation. I ask you to consider it. Naturally, I cannot categorically insist on it. In the first point where it says: To instruct the Supreme Soviet, the Soviet Presidium and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet to implement...[changes thought] and further in accordance with the text there are instructions to us, too, to ensure the implementation.

I would ask you to consider the possibility of writing: To instruct the Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR...[changes thought] and further in accordance with the text.

I think that the following lines of this point demand precisely this wording, for we would then have no responsibility according to this document in fulfilling the very important decisions of the third congress. Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Further on Yeltsin 'Personality Cult'

LD0504154891 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2021 GMT 4 Apr 91

[Remarks by Boris Mikhaylovich Isayev, deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet and people's deputy, at the Extraordinary Third Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies in the Kremlin, Moscow, on 4 April—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed people's deputies, esteemed electors, I have indeed already said that the political behavior of the chairman is leading to paralysis in the activities of the corps of deputies and the Supreme Soviet. Instead of a return to normal, as has on the whole been happening at the congress, there is again an attempt to strengthen the regime of personal power.

Is it not for the sake of this that the economic and political situation in Russia has become so aggravated? This policy will bring Russia to its knees. And based on what? To strengthen personal dictatorship? At this congress, we have voted six times on the question of the president. When this does not get through, we get a statement from the chairman.

We propose continuing the discussion of the agenda. How can we vote for such a decision, for the adoption of a federal treaty and a Union treaty? We have given thought to the fate of the autonomous formations. Then each of them will start to adopt their own decision on emergency powers. In accordance with the instruction of the congress—Comrades, may I have your attention—in accordance with the instruction of the congress, we propose preparing a document about the state structure, and returning to the adoption of the proposed draft law on fully realistic anti-crisis measures which are not contrary to the Constitution. We need to think of getting Russia out of its crisis, and not about personalities.

In the final analysis, the question today is not about Russia but about replacing one dictatorship by another dictatorship. Neither option suits us, nor does a personality cult suit us.

It is necessary to carry out in a clear fashion the decisions of the congress and, by our joint efforts, Russia get out of its crisis. Russia must not be pushed into chaos, catastrophe and lawlessness.

Thank you for your attention.

IZVESTIYA Views 3 Apr Congress Debates

PM0504131691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Apr 91 Union Edition pp 1-2

[Report by I. Demchenko and G. Shipitko: "Resolution Adopted on B. Yeltsin's Report"]

[Text] On 3 April the Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies discussed the draft resolution "On the Political and Socioeconomic Situation in the RSFSR and Measures To Surmount the Crisis." The document points out that the present complex situation in the republic is part of the profound economic and political crisis of the USSR as a whole. Its development is being adversely affected by the inconsistent and contradictory nature of a number of the decisions adopted by the union and republic governments and by the lack of clear-cut legal mechanisms for interaction between RSFSR and USSR organs and within the Russian Federation itself.

The Congress charged the RSFSR Government with finalizing a program to stabilize the economy and make the switch to market relations and also with drawing up the republic's emergency budget and forming the gold-currency reserve of the republican Foreign Trade Bank. Parliament and the government were charged with examining the demands of representatives of the strike movement and taking urgent measures to settle the conflicts which arise. A package of measures to revive the agrarian sector is drawn up in the resolution.

The political part of the draft resolution provoked the greatest arguments. The Congress did not accept the point which charged the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium with beginning talks on the creation of a "Roundtable of National Concord" on both a union and a republican level. Nor was the necessary number of votes obtained in order to approve putting a proposal to the union parliament, the USSR president, and the republic Supreme Soviets to begin forming a coalition union government of people's trust and national concord without delay. The point in the document which spoke of ensuring conditions for holding nationwide multiple-candidate elections of the RSFSR president at the end of May and the beginning of June 1991 was also deleted. Finally, a point on banning the activities of any political parties and movements within the structures of organs of the Prosecutor's Office, justice, the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], the KGB, the state apparatus, etc. was rejected.

Answering journalists' questions after the end of the session, R. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, said that the compromises reached as a result of the discussion can hardly be called successful. "Many deputies," he pointed out, "were unable or unwilling to comprehend the essence of the wording in the draft resolution, and some came to the Congress for quite a different purpose altogether. Of course, the exclusion of these points from the resolution will complicate our work, but it is also possible to travel the path of reforms within the framework of the decisions adopted."

R. Khasbulatov also said that the aim of the RSFSR leadership is not so much strong as effective power. Therefore, simultaneously with the introduction of the post of head of state and the strengthening of his rights, the municipal power structure will also be strengthened in the republic and self-management trends will be reinforced. He expressed confidence that the necessary decisions will be adopted if not at this, then at the next Congress, which will take place in May-June.

R. Khasbulatov told journalists to look with understanding on the certain compromise and indecision displayed by deputies at the time of the vote. "The deputies' position reflects the level of public awareness, and society always finds it hard to get used to new ideas," he said. "Moreover, many deputies are under the great influence of ideological principles. You must understand that they find it very difficult to adopt decisions which run counter to these principles."

As we have already reported, the 3 April morning session began with a speech by the USSR general prosecutor. And the day ended, quite logically, with speeches by MVD leaders. At the request of a group of deputies RSFSR Internal Affairs Minister V. Barannikov reported on the crime situation in the republic, which he called "unprecedented and critical." There were 1.839 million crimes in Russia last year, and the increase this year is approximately 20 percent. Crime, the minister said, is taking an increasingly clearly expressed mercenary and violent direction, and the criminal world is being consolidated. Conventional crime is merging with economic and organized crime. More and more young people and officials are being drawn into crime.

Then I. Shilov, USSR first deputy minister of internal affairs, replied to a deputy's question about the safeguarding of public order in Moscow on the day of the 28 March rally. He declared that on the day the Congress opened "normal life was maintained in the capital, and the city's usual work rhythm was preserved practically in full. The measures taken were valid and timely and were not of a political nature."

To judge from the reaction of the majority of the deputies who put questions, they disliked this means of ensuring order, because of which it was even necessary to interrupt the Congress, just as Muscovites themselves dislike such "normal life in the capital."

The pleasant state of mutual understanding at the Congress did not last long. Today brought everyone back to their former reluctance to waive principles. The 4 April morning session, which was opened by B. Yeltsin, began in quite a businesslike atmosphere. The deputies renounced the traditional half-hour warm-up and decided to get down to work at once. The chairman proposed endeavoring to close the Congress today. The deputies had only to examine approximately 20 pages of amendments—one-third of what had already been done.

The debate at once developed over amendments to Point 18. As a result of the discussion, a decision was adopted on the need to introduce into the Supreme Soviet's work practice a regular briefing by the Supreme Soviet chairman and the Council of Ministers chairman on the political and socioeconomic situation in the republic. Since the likelihood of the Congress being drawn into an endless discussion of amendments and additions had arisen once again, B. Yeltsin proposed renouncing additional articles in the draft resolution—which was accepted—and then the deputies adopted the resolution as a whole.

After this B. Yeltsin took the floor to make a statement. He proposed endowing the Supreme Soviet and its leadership with emergency powers. These powers, he said, will be of a temporary nature and will cease after the election of the president.

Then the floor was taken by S. Goryacheva, who declared that the presidential post is Yeltsin's chief goal and that he is ready to do anything. And, before voting, it is necessary to think about whose hands power is being passed to.

A very stormy exchange of opinions with regard to B. Yeltsin's statement lasted until the break.

Komissarov Named to Moscow Internal Affairs Post

Appointed Despite Decree

LD0604193391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1851 GMT 6 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr (TASS)—Lieutenant General Viktor Barannikov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] internal affairs minister, today signed an order appointing Major General Vyacheslav Komissarov to head the Main Directorate for Internal Affairs of the Moscow City Executive Committee. This appointment was announced today by the press service of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The order says that this has been done in conformity with the RSFSR Council of Ministers' decision "on improving the work of internal affairs organs in the RSFSR" and on the basis of a decision by the Moscow City Soviet of People's Deputies.

As you know, on 26 March, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev issued a decree transferring the functions of the main directorates for internal affairs of the Moscow City Executive Committee and the Moscow Oblast Executive Committee to a new main directorate attached to the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry responsible for the city of Moscow and the surrounding oblast. The same decree appointed the head of this body.

The USSR president's move, however, met with a negative response from the participants in the extraordinary congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, who described the decree as "a violation of the constitutions of the USSR and Russia, as well as the declaration on the state sovereignty of the RSFSR." As a result of the discussions, it was decided to suspend the validity of the decree. Responsibility for maintaining public order was vested in the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

Pugo Refutes Appointment

LD0604204191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2005 GMT 6 Apr 91

[Unscheduled announcement; read by announcer]

[Text] Esteemed Comrades! It was reported in the "Vremya" program that by order of Barranikov, internal affairs minister of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], Komissarov was appointed chief of the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee Main Internal Affairs Administration. Later, however, a refutation was received on behalf of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry. It says that, in accordance with a decree by USSR President Gorbachev and an order by USSR Internal Affairs Minister Pugo, the previously confirmed Shilov, USSR first deputy internal affairs minister, remains chief of the main Internal Affairs Administration for Moscow and Moscow Oblast.

Hunger Strike Against Pugo Action

LD0704143191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1351 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Text] We have been given a statement by a group of hunger- striking deputies of the Moscow city soviet today. It is about the revocation by Boris Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs, of the order by Viktor Barannikov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] minister of internal affairs, on the appointment of Vyacheslav Komissarov as chief of the Moscow Main Directorate of Internal Affairs.

The statement by Moscow city soviet deputies says, in particular, that the group of hunger-striking deputies of the Moscow city soviet demand, as before, implementation of the RSFSR Constitution and the republican laws, in accordance with which General Kommissarov should be presented to the men of the Moscow militia tomorrow, Monday.

Soviet, Russian Officials Meet

LD0804134191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1258 GMT 8 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 8 Apr (TASS)—The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs public relations center reports:

A meeting was held in the Main Internal Affairs Directorate of the Moscow city soviet executive committee on 8 April between the leadership of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs; Sergey Stankevich, the first deputy chairman of the Moscow city soviet; and Yuriy Luzhkov, the chairman of the Moscow city soviet executive committee. The issues relating to the appointment of the head of the city's Internal Affairs Directorate by the Moscow city executive committee were discussed.

Referring to the Moscow city soviet decision, Yuriy Luzhkov categorically demanded that militia Major-General Vyacheslav Komissarov be confirmed in the post as head of the city's Internal Affairs Directorate. He stated that if this is not done, then "actions corresponding to the situation as it stands" will be taken on the part of people's deputies and public opinion.

As is known, a decree by the USSR president on 26 March 1991 set up the main directorate of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs for Moscow and the oblast on the basis of the Main Directorate of Internal Affairs of the Moscow city executive committee and the Main Directorate of Internal Affairs of the Moscow oblast executive committee. At the same time, it was taken into account that unification on a single basis of the efforts of the internal affairs organs of the capital and oblast would assist the strengthening of law and order and would make it possible to fight crime more effectively.

The above measure was carried out in full accordance with the law.

Police Lieutenant General Ivan Shilov, first deputy minister of USSR internal affairs, is head of the newly established Main Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Center-Russian 'Accord' on Northern Territories

OW0504181191 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 1000 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Report on "exclusive" NHK interview with Andrey Vladimirovich Kozyrev, minister of foreign affairs of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, in Moscow on 4 April]

[Text] Kozyrev, foreign minister of the Russian Republic, who will visit Japan with President Gorbachev as the representative of the republic, said in an exclusive interview with NHK on 4 April that the Russian Republic and the central Soviet Government had already agreed on proposals to be made by President Gorbachev during his visit to Japan this month. He indicated that the proposals will include the Soviet Government's position on the territorial dispute between the Soviet Union and Japan.

As the political conflict between the central Soviet Government and the Russian Republic deepens, the Russian Republic's attitude on Soviet policy toward Japan holds the key to future development of Soviet-Japanese relations.

Under such circumstances, Foreign Minister Kozyrev granted an exclusive interview to NHK on 4 April, and stated as follows when asked if the rivalry between President Gorbachev and Chairman Yeltsin might endanger the success of the president's visit to Japan:

[Begin Kozyev recording in Russian with subtitled translation into Japanese] The Russian Republic's participation in negotiations between Japan and the Soviet Union will not complicate bilateral issues, but rather help resolve them. The Russian Republic essentially shares a common view with President Gorbachev. [end recording]

Foreign Minister Kozyrev thus revealed for the first time that the central government and the Russian Republic have already reached an accord on Soviet proposals to be made during President Gorbachev's Japan visit.

Kozyrev also discussed the Russian Republic's stance toward the northern territories issue. He said it is an urgent task for the republic to remove the obstacle to improved ties with Japan, which the republic regards as an important neighbor. He added that the Russian Republic agreed with the central government on starting serious negotiaitons on this issue.

However, Kozyrev noted that this issue cannot be resolved all at once; rather, the two countries should make progress step by step by coping with political and economic problems simultaneously. He thus expressed a positive attitude toward settling the territorial issue, but indicated that Gorbachev's visit will mark only the first step toward the settlement.

Gorbachev To Visit Khabarovsk Japanese Cemetery

LD0804104991 Moscow TASS in English 1034 GMT 8 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Vitrishchak]

[Text] Khabarovsk April 8 TASS—A visit to a Japanese cemetery is on the programme of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's two-day stay here on the eve of his official visit to Japan, which begins on April 16.

Gorbachev is expected to lay a wreath at the tombs of former Japanese prisoners-of-war held captive in the Soviet Far East after the end of the Second World War.

More than 180 POW's, who died mainly of diseases, were buried at the Japanese cemetery in Khabarovsk. The cemetery is maintained with money from the local budget and is regularly visited by official Japanese delegations, relatives of those buried here, and by tourists.

Due to close contacts established between a number of public organisations in the Soviet Far East and the Japanese associations of former prisoners-of-war, full lists of the dead are being verified and prepared for publication.

Work is also under way to restore cemeteries in Khabarovsk and Maritime territories, in Amur, Irkutsk, Chita, and Magadan regions, and the Buryat autonomous republic, where 46,082 Japanese POWs died, according to a bulletin from the Japanese association of former prisoners-of-war.

Miners Continue Strike Despite Pavlov Talks

LD0504182891 Moscow TASS in English 1755 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin]

[Text] Kemerovo (Western Siberia) April 5 TASS—Important decisions, taken after Soviet Premier Valentin Pavlov's talks with miners, have yet to win support and approval among miners of the Kuzbass coal-mining basin.

The number of striking coal-mining enterprises has not decreased in the past twenty four hours.

Forty six out of 76 mines stand idle, as do some coal-dressing factories, collieries and shaft-building organisations. Iron and steel works receive only 35 per cent of their coking coal requirements. A total of 8,000 wagons are stranded at the Kemerovo railway waiting to be loaded with coal.

Moscow Students Demonstrate for Grants, Food Aid

LD0804112191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1024 GMT 8 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 8 Apr (TASS)—"We demand deputy's privileges for students"—members of the Presidium of the Moscow Soviet, who had assembled for a routine sitting, were met by such a poster on Soviet Square [Sovetskaya Ploshchad] today. It was here that the association of trade union organizations of the students of the capital decided to hold a rally. Their demands: increasing grants, reducing the price of foodstuffs in higher educational establishments, providing free travel on municipal transport. The trade union leaders of the capital's students insisted upon a meeting with representatives of the Moscow Soviet standing commission for education—the leader of which, E. Bakirov, assured the demonstrators that their demands will be studied attentively.

"Price reform has turned poverty into destitution; and if nothing is done, future specialists will be left without the means to exist by the middle of the month," A. Shcherbina, chairman of the asociation and head of the trade union committee of the Moscow Institute of Oil and Gas, told a TASS correspondent. "Taking account of the fact that the Moscow city executive committee on 9 April will discuss questions of the material base and the social protection of students and teachers of the capital's higher educational establishments, we decided to hand over our wishes in this way. Therefore, tomorrow we will assemble in front of the Moscow Soviet again and will await the decision."

Moscow Soviet Votes To Establish Militia

LD0804145391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1350 GMT 8 Apr 91

[Text] The issue of what the Moscow militia should be like was tackled at the session of the Presidium of the Moscow city soviet. A resolution on setting up a Moscow municipal militia was adopted unanimously. This was a proposal put forward by the group of deputies who started a hunger strike 20 days ago, owing to the fact that General Komissarov was not confirmed as chief of the Moscow militia by the ministry [USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs].

One more issue which is currently being decided by the Presidium of the Moscow city soviet is whether to stop financing the main directorate of internal affairs for Moscow and Moscow Oblast, which was removed from subordination to the capital's authorities following the decree issued by the USSR president.

Whether or not the hunger strike by Moscow deputies—whose condition is reported to be critical—will continue depends on the outcome of the vote on this issue. We will report on the results of this in our evening bulletins.

Moscow Executive Committee Reviews Prices

LD0504174591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] A regular meeting of the anti-crisis committee was held today at the Moscow Soviet Executive Committee. The meeting, chaired by Executive Committee Chairman Luzhkov, summed up the first effects on Moscow life after the price increases. It was noted that shop lines have noticeably diminished and there have been fewer customers at most of the capital's shops. On public transport, less money is coming in from passengers. The explanation for all this is very simple: Many people are simply unable to afford the fare of 15 kopecks.

The anti-crisis committee meeting heard reports from (Kornoukhov), first deputy chairman of the Moscow Soviet Executive Committee; (Bugayev), deputy chief of the city directorate for internal affairs; and (Zaslavskiy), general director of the Moscow Labor Exchange.

Much attention was devoted to the problem of social protection for those families in which wives do not work. A preliminary decision was taken on material subsidies for such families.

Thousands Rally To Defend Tatar Sovereignty

LD0704174691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1630 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Text] Our life has become so politicized that even on days off reports come in on political topics.

Many thousands of working people attended a rally in defense of the sovereignty of Tatarstan, under the slogan "Sovereignty in Danger," in Freedom Square, Kazan's main square, today.

Our correspondent reports that the rally was held because of the reluctance of the central authorities and the leaders of the Russian Federation officially to recognize the sovereignty of the republic, which was declared at a session of the Supreme Soviet last August.

The rally issued a resolution saying that Tatarstan will sign the Union treaty only as a sovereign republic. Its working people, the resolution adds, will, regardless of nationality, come out in favor of the recognition of the sovereignty of Tatarstan.

Vladivostok 'Fully Satisfied' With Goryacheva

PM0504140991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Mar 91 Second Edition p 1

["Direct Line" report by correspondent Captain 1st Rank V. Shirokov: "In Support of S. Goryacheva"]

[Text] Vladivostok—A voters' meeting attended by garrison seamen adopted a resolution in support of the position taken by S. Goryacheva, deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. It notes that the voters of Vladivostok's Leninskiy Rayon are fully satisfied with their deputy's work, and think that her position is not in the least inconsistent with democratic principles and parliamentary ethics. On the contrary, it rather acts as a brake on Head of Parliament B. Yeltsin's desire to personally resolve questions that are under the jurisdiction of the Supreme Soviet.

The press has already reported that certain voters in Vladivostok have organized a campaign in favor of S. Goryacheva's view. An action committee has been set up, which has collected signatures in support of this action. And now this voters' meeting adopted a decision to set up an action committee in support of their deputy.

Press on 'Communists of Russia' News Conference

PM0504161391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Mar 91 First Edition p 3

[Report by N. Garifullina: "Stand Taken by 'Communists of Russia'"]

[Text] Ever since last year and the appearance of their scandalously renowned program, the "Democrats" have been doing their utmost to frighten society with the looming threat of an "iron fist" dictatorship, and have apparently been so over-zealous that they have frightened themselves to death, because they have now begun to imagine a "conspiracy" by bad Communists against very nice Democrats. They did not fail to convey this to the Russian public at large in their Address by the Democratic Russia Coordination Council to the People's Deputies and Peoples of Russia (no more and no less), urgently circulated on Thursday in the sittings hall and corridors of the congress among members of the press and others invited to attend. It is categorically stated in the very first lines: "The main aim of 'Communists of Russia' at the Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies is to remove B. Yeltsin from the post of chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet." Several lines later, we read the desperate plea: "We hope that the common sense and responsibility of most Russian deputies will prevent a conspiracy against the leader of Russian democracy." It cannot be denied that, since this "manifesto", there has been tension in the air, as if before a storm. Consequently, it is quite natural that one of the first questions asked—point-blank, as the saying goes—at yesterday's press conference of deputies representing the "Communists of Russia" faction was this:

"Is it really true that 'Communists of Russia' want to topple Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin?"

"Action rather than personalities must be paramount, because any confrontation and conflict of personalities—between Gorbachev, Yeltsin, and so forth—will take us into the realm of personal rivalry and claims which often have no bearing on the matter in hand," B. Tarasov, chief of the Volga-Urals Military District Political Directorate, said. "Consequently, when demanding that an extraordinary congress be convened, we were working on the basis that we need to analyze in a proper, thorough, well-argued way the policy personified by Yeltsin, give it a political and legal assessment, and, on this basis, await the conclusions to be drawn by the congress. I can categorically say that 'Communists of Russia' have not expressed any opinion or proposal to 'get rid of Yeltsin.'"

"But what about the fake document referred to by People's Deputy S.N. Baburin at a congress sitting?"

"I am holding that leaflet in my hand now," B. Kibirev, second secretary of Krasnodar Kray CPSU Committee, said, showing everyone. "It is entitled: 'Working Record of a Series of Basic Proposals Made at a Joint Meeting of

"Communists of Russia" Groups'.... The leaflet was distributed by the Leningrad delegation and is supposed to contain 'leading principles of "Communists of Russia."' It is a form of pressure on us and an attempt to discredit Communists by saying: This is the kind of destructive role they play. We do not think this is a very civilized way of dealing with one's political opponents. We believe that struggles must be waged and policies made honestly."

Well, let us join "Democratic Russia" in hoping for common sense and responsibility...

North Ossetia's Galazov Interviewed

PM0804091591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

[Interview with A. Galazov, chairman of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel N. Astashkin; place, date of interview not given: "We Count on President's Aid"]

[Text] [Astashkin] Akhsarbek Khadzhimurzayevich, what is your attitude toward the idea of a Union treaty?

[Galazov] My attitude is the attitude which my people expressed toward this idea 17 March at the all-Union referendum. Some 85.9 percent of the people on the lists took part in it. Of these 90.2 percent said "yes" to the USSR.

Now about the draft Union treaty itself. Basically it was approved. It is true that there were some comments and proposals. If you recall the first version did not say clearly that the Union remains Soviet, that we retain the right of a socialist choice. Our amendment was taken into account. In addition from the outset we insisted on eliminating the historical and legal injustice expressed in the division of republics into union and autonomous republics. Such a division simply does not exist in world practice, each republic has its own constitution and is a sovereign state. That was also taken into account.

At the ninth session of the North Ossetian Supreme Soviet 20 March, the people's deputies took a decision on the draft of this version of the Union treaty. Here too we had several comments. for instance, our declaration on sovereignty states that the republic is a subject both of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the USSR. That is why it may be said unequivocally that we will sign both the Russian federative treaty and the Union treaty.. As for the question of how to sign, in my view the Union treaty should be signed by all republics—both union and autonomous. The initial position here comes down to the following. If the republics join the Union as equal subjects that in my opinion will be the renewal of which we are speaking now.

[Astashkin] In this connection I have the following question. Recently B.N. Yeltsin, the head of the Russian legislature, has frequently voiced the idea that when signing the Union treaty we should not consider the voices of the autonomous formations on a par with the voices of the Union republics. How do you assess that?

[Galazov] I do not share that position. There are 20 autonomous republics in the Union. They are all states which have their own constitutions. Take the North Ossetia Constitution, for instance. In particular it states that the North Ossetian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic is a socialist state of all the people expressing the will and interests of the republic's workers, peasants, intelligentsia, and working people of all nationalities. A clause of approximately the same purport is included in the Constitutions of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and other republics called Union republics. Incidentally, in the last draft of the Union treaty the inequality between the Union and autonomous republic, at least in definition, has been removed. As a result my answer to the question will be as follows: Unless you consider the voice of the 16 republics which belong to the RSFSR then it is more honest to call the RSFSR simply the Russian Republic. What has federation to do with it?

[Astashkin] Akhsarbek Khadzhimurzayevich, what in your view should be the position of the Army and internal troops in the renewed Union?

[Galazov] My position on this plane is absolutely clear. I believe that our Army should be united and should defend the interests of the entire Union and entire multinational state. I do not see how one can divide the army along national lines. It will immediately become weaker and the country's defense capability will be reduced. And how to share out nuclear weapons among the republics? In my view the internal troops should also be all-Union troops.

Now about the Ossetian people's attitude toward the Army. It is well known that our small republic has given the country 65 generals, who include renowned military leaders like Twice Hero of the Soviet Union I. Pliyev and Hero of the Soviet Union Army General G. Khetagurov. Incidentally, now, too, we have very close ties with the command of the North Caucasus Military District.

[Astashkin] As is well known, subunits from across the border are stationed on the republic's territory. In this connection rumors are being spread that the servicemen are being settled on this territory, which used to belong to the Ingush.

[Galazov] I do not agree with that claim. On the territory where the subunits are now stationed military were traditionally deployed long before the so-called Ossetian-Ingush problem. Thus, for instance, the military township in Prigorodnyy Rayon was formed back during the Great Patriotic War, that is precisely when the Ingush lived here.

[Astashkin] And another question about rumors. In connection with the events in South Ossetia the rumor is being spread that somewhere near Mozdok a training center has been created to train Ossetian thugs and that it is headed by Tsagolov.

[Galazov] A real "canard!" Kim Tsagolov is in Moscow. He has not been here for about 18 months. I communicate with him only by telephone. He could hardly lead the thugs' training by telephone. In addition there is quite a strong leadership in Mozdokskiy Rayon. It would not allow the creation of such a center. Not only do we not practice anything of the kind in Mozdokskiy Rayon, we do not practice it anywhere. And that despite the very complex situation in South Ossetia, despite the appeal to us from a number of information public organizations requesting that we issue weapons to young people so that they can go to the assistance of their blood brothers. We are restraining these feelings and trying to extinguish them. We are counting on succeeding, with the aid of the USSR president, the country's Supreme Soviet, and the internal troops, on disarming both Georgian and Ossetian terrorists. After all, a terrorist is a bandit, whoever he may be. And bandits should be treated according to the law. If, of course, we want to become a democratic, civilized state.

Western Republics

Majority in Georgia Vote for Independence

LD0504182191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1630 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] Tbilisi: it has been reported from here that the final results have been calculated of the referendum held in Georgia on 31 March, which had one question to be answered. Do you agree to the restoration of the state independence of Georgia on the basis of the act on independence of Georgia of 26 May 1918?

According to the figures released by the central referendum commission, more than 99 percent of the voters who took part in the voting said "Yes", and just over a half percent said "No". In Abkhazia about 98 percent of those who took part in the referendum voted in favor of the state independence of Georgia, and there was the same result in Adzharia, where more than 97 percent voted in favor of Georgia's state independence.

Because of the tense situation on the territory of the abolished South Ossetian oblast it was only in Tskhinvali and the (Kornisskiy) and Dzhavskiy rayons that the referendum did not take place.

Belorussian Capital 'Rocked' by Protests

PM0504231791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[M. Shimanskiy report: "Workers in the Square"]

[Text] Minsk—Belorussia has never seen anything like it. Its capital, Minsk, has been rocked by powerful workers' demonstrations...

During the day on 4 April a powerful wave of people swept down Minsk's main thoroughfare, the Leninskiy Prospect. It spilled into the vast Lenin Square and moved up to Government House. Thousands of people left their work stations at enterprises and came here without changing out of their working clothes. Later they were joined by groups of students and vocational technical school pupils. I was in the square and I talked to many people. They all said the same thing. They are shocked by the new prices, and they simply do not know how they will live tomorrow. One woman was weeping and repeating over and over again: "I earn 200 rubles [R] a month. I am alone with two children. How will I feed them and clothe them when everything for children has gone up several-fold... and lunch in the works canteen has gone up to R3."

What demands did the rally participants put forward? First and foremost—a whole series of economic demands. An increase in wages and compensation payments proportional to the increase in retail prices, abolition of the 5-percent sales tax, a 15-percent reduction in the payments into the state budget from enterprises' profits. This was followed by political demands for the resignation of the USSR president and the chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet and dissolution of the union and republic governments.

Passions in the square were running at fever pitch. Time and again you could hear calls beginning "Down With!" Uproar, noise, and whistling. No, this was quite unlike the normally calm and levelheaded inhabitants of Minsk. But could it be that this is a quite logical development? Could it be that our entire policy has simply reduced the quiet city to this state?

V. Kebich, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], went up to the microphone. He said that the republic government is, together with the trade unions, discussing how the situation could be alleviated and looking for means to increase compensation payments. No one listened to him.

A strike committee was elected at the rally. In the afternoon Kebich met with its representatives. The premier stressed that if the strikes assumed a mass scale, they would completely ruin the republic economy. Let enterprises resume work, Kebich proposed, and we will immediately open talks on how the labor collectives' demands could be met.

Toward the end of the day another meeting opened in Government House. Government members and Minsk enterprise leaders had gathered. The republic government views the workers' demands with understanding. But who is to foot the bill for wage increases, cuts in the cost of lunches in works and student canteens, and cheaper goods for children? Where will the money come from? The republic budget deficit is enormous. After all, the Government of the Belorussian SSR has no right to siphon off money from the republic program to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl catastrophe. Should one wait for union organs to offer financial assistance? It seems pointless. Trying to alleviate labor collectives' problems by raising wages would mean the curtailment of certain social programs.

The Belorussian SSR Government and the republic Trade Union Federation adopted a draft decision on additional measures to provide social protection for the population. Very important measures. In particular it is planned to reduce the cost of food in workers, student, and school canteens and snack bars. Measures to reform the wages of workers and employees are also envisaged. It is proposed to review the list of prices for children's goods laid down by the Union government. The document has been sent to republic labor collectives for discussion.

The situation as of 5 April remains nonetheless tense. The collective of the motor plant is not working at full capacity since this morning. At the "Luch" footwear association subsidiary workers are negotiating with the administration. The same applies at the no. 4 construction trust. For the time being workers are not out in the streets and squares. All the members of the Belorussian Government are addressing labor collectives. All these meetings have one and the same aim—dialogue and mutual understanding are needed during these difficult days rocking the republic.

Strike Demands Detailed

LD0504194591 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Report by correspondent Aleksey Zhuk, including recorded remarks by Vyacheslav Frantsevich Kebich, chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers, at a worker's meeting on 5 April; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Now for a painful theme—the price increases. After the price increases, a complex situation has come about in the Belorussian capital. Tens of thousands of strikers have been putting forward their demands and are awaiting the government's response. Here is a more detailed report from Minsk by our correspondent.

[Zhuk] The wave of strikes, that before this had fortunately bypassed our Republic, has as a result of the price increases also reached the Belorussian capital and other towns.

First there was a warning strike at the Kozlov electrical engineering works. Then yesterday there was a mass rally in Lenin Square, where representatives of the work collectives of the city's major enterprises, practically all the town's enterprises, gathered. It had come about through the strike, and a whole package of demands were put forward. If one is to speak briefly about the demands, then they essentially boil down to one thing—that earnings should be increased given the sharp increase in prices and that compensation should be paid for the outlay on public catering, as it has become much more expensive. Dinners in the factory canteens have doubled and tripled in price. There should also be compensation—or rather compensation should be increased—for expenditure connected with the acquisition of children's goods. There were other demands as well.

There have been talks, complex talks, between the government and trade unions of Belorussia on the one hand and the leaders of the strike on the other.

Today the leaders of the Belorussian government and its trade unions traveled to plants to have meetings with work collectives and to reach agreement on working out a joint decision to stabilize the situation.

[Kebich] At the present time in Belorussia it is difficult to say but roughly 65 to 70 percent of the population is to get full compensation. The remainder is not due to receive any compensation. Perceiving all this, we have started to work on how thats possible when the country will give us no further help in our budget—I have said that we drew up a budget with a deficit of 3.5 billion rubles [R] out of an overall budget of R16 billion, that is to say a budget with a 25 percent deficit—but we have nevertheless begun to seek some possibilities on adopting further decisions of our own. [paragraph as received]

All catering in canteens, snack bars, hostels, and children's catering in hostels is to be fully compensated out of the profits of enterprises, excluding the payments of earnings. In other words, this is not being included in the basic earnings.

The cost of children's goods is to be halved. We literally intend to adopt such a decision today. We are doing this, however, out of consideration for the fact that the costs of children's goods have most painfully affected mothers. Therefore the halving of prices will, I think, be some kind of protection measure, but in this case, of course, children's goods will be sold only for coupons.

Furthermore, we have decided that we will also cancel the 5 percent tax on public catering. That is to say, we have canceled it, as I have already said, on foodstuffs, children's goods, apartment rents, and hostel payments. Now we are removing this 5 percent tax on public catering as well.

The Minsk City Soviet Executive Committee has been instructed in all snack bars to take measures through local budgets to reduce the price of catering, including through profits as I have already said, at workers' canteens, student hostels, student canteens, school canteens, and snack bars. This has also affected people very painfully. We have decided, however, to give enterprises an opportunity to begin the gradual enhancement of earnings and to begin this literally immediately during the month of April, if only because earnings in Belorussia are lower than all-Union earnings.

Strikes Subsiding in Minsk

LD0504143791 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 5 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Gorelik]

[Text] Minsk April 5 TASS—A wave of strikes and spontaneous meetings that swept streets of the Belorussian capital on Thursday started subsiding today. Brief warning strikes were held at the footwear association "Luch" and two potassium mines of Soligorsk, 100 kilometres from Minsk, this morning.

A strike committee, elected at a meeting on Thursday, and headed by deputy of the Republican Supreme Soviet, tractor factory worker Sergey Antonchik, late last night agreed to the government's proposal that 24 hours be granted to elaborate specific measures to alleviate the impact of a rise in retail prices. The workers have reportedly strongly objected to a 200-300 per cent rise in the cost of meals at factory and especially at school canteens, a high rise in the price of goods for children.

A document "Extra measures for social security of the population" was drafted by the Government jointly with the republican Trade Union Council overnight. It suggests that retail prices of light industry goods for children be cut by 33-50 per cent, that funds be allocated from the state budget funds to make cheaper the cost of the meals at worker's, student and school canteens, that enterprises and organisations be allowed to chan[illegible] of their profits for the purpose, and that the 5 per cent tax on the canteen and cafe own products be cancelled. The document also provides for a stage-by- stage rise in wages and salaries in productive branches of the national economy.

According to preliminary estimates, all these innovations will double the republican budget deficit, which now stands at 3.5 billion roubles. The level of inflation will also sharply rise.

Nevertheless, the strike committee leaders do not rule out another wave of workers' strikes and other actions, the TASS correspondent has been told at the strike committee.

Dnestr Republic Enacts Law on Government

LD0504184491 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 5 Apr 91

[from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Dnestr republic—proclaimed anti-constitutional by the Moldovan legislature—has enacted a law on the government of the Dnestr Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [DMSSR]. According to the adopted document, the government constitutes the highest executive and administrative body of state authority of the Dnestr republic. The government functions on the basis and in fulfillment of the laws of the USSR and the DMSSR as well as other decisions of the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and the DMSSR, decrees of the USSR president and the DMSSR chairman, and decisions and orders of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

Belorussian Law on Indexation of Incomes

914A0557A

For the Belorussian Law on Indexation of Incomes published in the February 1991 EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN No 8, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-016, pages 15-17.

Caucasus

Ossetian Killed as Georgians Fire on Tskhinvali

LD0704172991 Moscow TASS in English 1642 GMT 7 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Sharayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz April 7 TASS—The press center of the emergency committee at the president of the North Ossetian Parliament today reported that the situation in South Ossetia remains extremely tense.

Georgian gunmen are firing from the village of Tamarasheni situated in the suburbs of Tskhinvali, South Ossetian administrative center.

According to information from the North Ossetian Interior Ministry, the Georgian side conducted heavy fire at the besieged city early today. One Ossetian was killed and several wounded. Several houses were damaged.

There are over 300 seriously wounded people in the regional hospital, who need urgent surgical aid. However, it is impossible to evacuate them from the city: all roads are blocked by gunmen, and there is a shortage of helicopters.

Lorries with humanitarian aid arrived from Vladikavkaz to South Ossetia today, the opening day of the all-union charity week. They reached Dzhava where they were stopped by gunmen who refused to permit them to go to Tskhinvali.

The city is in dire need of foodstuffs, medicines and fuel. There are big snags in electricity, water and gas supplies.

Scene Around Tskhinvali Described

LD0704184791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 7 Apr 91

[Text] With regard to the situation in South Ossetia, we have just received a report from the city of Tskhinvali by our special correspondent Vladimir Plotnikov.

[Plotnikov] The situation in and around the city still resembles a battle front. Each night, exchanges of fire are heard, and just before Easter on the line between Tskhinvali and outlying Georgian villages—in particular the village of Tamarasheni—a real battle flared up. It lasted approximately two and a half hours. Some NUR [neupravlyayemyy reaktivnyy snaryad] free-flight rockets were launched. There was heavy machine-gun fire, and there are dead and wounded on both sides.

The funerals of two of those who died—both young lads—will be held in Tskhinvali on Tuesday. The city remains under tight blockade. Railway tracks have rusted, highways have been blocked off by Georgian fighters, and not one industrial enterprise is operating, with the exception of the bakery—but this is producing bread with mixed cereal, because flour is running out. Domestic stocks of goods are being exhausted. Of the two markets, only one is now operating and is selling primarily meat, apples, and spices. There are practically no vegetables. There is no milk, although there are many children in the city.

The food problem has also been made more severe by the fact that there are many refugees in the city from plundered villages. Thousands of people are living in a constant state of fear for themselves and their relatives and for the houses and livestock they have left behind.

Another feature has appeared in the life of the city: looting. Several cases have already been noted where property is dragged out of the houses of Georgians and even Ossetians who have left, and for this reason a night raid to combat looting was conducted recently.

On two occasions already, meetings have been held that were attended by several thousand inhabitants and refugees. They adopted appeals to the country's president for the introduction of a state of emergency.

In conclusion, I will mention that an operational group of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs investigating crimes committed on the territory of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast during the conflict has started its work.

Violence Continues

AU0504145291 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Russian 1345 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] As reported by the Press Center of the Georgian Interior Ministry, tonight [5 April], Ossetian extremists again fired submachine guns and launched rockets on the village of Tamarasheni in the Tskhinvali rayon and on the village of Avnevi in the Kornisi rayon. There are no casualties.

On 4 April, the Ossetian bandits began shooting at the people who came to the village of (?Pekhvi) in the Tskhinvali rayon to take part in a funeral. The bookkeeper of the collective farm [name indistinct] Miranashvili was wounded. [words indistinct] lifted the wounded man up on his shoulders and tried to take him to a quiet place. However, he was also wounded. Immediately after the Georgian militiamen intervened, the attackers stopped shooting and escaped.

Today, one more column of internal troops entered Tskhinvali from the direction of Gori. With regard to the information reported yesterday about the arrival in Samachablo of four truckloads of military subunits from the direction of [name indistinct], this information turned out to be inaccurate. The Mamison mountain pass and [words indistinct] are presently closed.

Situation 'Extremely Tense'

LD0604193691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1800 GMT 6 Apr 91

[Text] TASS reports that, according to information received on 6 April by the press center of the extraordinary committee under the chairman of the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet from the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] of North Ossetia, the situation in South Ossetia remains extremely tense. Armed clashes between opposing sides continue in the village of Tamarasheni of the Tskhinvalskiy Rayon. Intense shooting took place here on 5 April from 1600 to 2100 hours [local time]. The night in Tskhinvali itself was relatively calm, but shooting took place again in the suburbs.

The town is tightly surrounded by armed gangs from the illegal formations, numbering more than 15,000 people, which have (?military hardware) equipment at their disposal. All the main detour roads in South Ossetia are controlled by the Georgian side. The fighters do not let vehicles with humanitarian help through to Tskhinvali. The town has run out of flour; there is no medicine or fuel. Electric power, water, and gas is delivered with great interruptions.

The situation in the Ossetian villages which have been spared destruction so far also remains uneasy. They are totally controlled by the armed Georgian formations.

Azerbaijan Officials' Helicopter Shot Down

LD0504201291 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1939 GMT 5 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, April 5 (TANJUG)—A helicopter carrying senior officials of the Soviet Republic of Azerbaijan crashed after being shot from the ground, the Azerbaijani news agency reported on Friday evening.

The agency showed shots taken by the television team on board the craft as proof that the helicopter was shot down.

It said the helicopter split into two parts and caught fire as it hit the ground but the passengers and crew were only lightly injured.

Initial reports said that the craft, which was carrying Azerbaijani parliament President Karaev and a group of deputies, had made an emergency landing due to a fault on its propeller.

The incident occurred on the territory of the autonomous region of Nagorno-Karabakh, which is a part of Azerbaijan but whose majority population is Armenian.

Azerbaijan and Armenia have been in dispute over the region for many years.

The border between the two southern Soviet republics is guarded by the army of the Interior Ministry.

Kirghiz Communist Leader Released From Post

LD0604175291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1506 GMT 6 Apr 91

[By TASS Correspondent]

[Text] Bishkek, 6 Apr (TASS)—A.M. Masaliyev has been released from his post as first secretary and bureau member of the Communist Party of Kirghizia Central Committee. This is at his own request in connection with his transfer to a post within the CPSU Central Committee apparatus. This decision was adopted at today's fourth plenum of the Central Committee of the republican Communist Party.

There were two contenders for the post of first secretary. A majority of votes was received by Zh.B. Amanbayev, formerly first secretary of the party's Issyk-Kul Oblast Committee.

In line with the republic's new name, the plenum decided that the Communist Party of Kirghizia should be renamed the Communist Party of Kyrgystan. It also discussed the question of the republican party organization's budget for 1991.

Georgian Draft Law on Economic System

914A0552A

For this draft law published in the 7 March 1991 VESTNIK GRUZII, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-016, pages 9-12.

Central Asia

Turkmen SSR Approves Draft Union Treaty

LD0504174391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1548 GMT 15 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 5 Apr (TASS)—The Supreme Soviet of the Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] has become the first parliament of a Union republic to approve the draft treaty on the union of sovereign republics. It instructed the republic's president, presidium, and government to do their utmost to bring about the earliest possible conclusion of the new Union treaty.

According to IZVESTIYA today, a plenipotentiary delegation of the Turkmen SSR headed by Saparmurad Niyazov, the president of the republic, and Sakhat Muradov, chairman of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet, has been formed to carry out further harmonization of the text of the treaty, its protocols, and its appendices and then sign it.

A decision adopted by the Supreme Soviet says that "the draft treaty of the sovereign republics reflects the changes which have taken place in the country's life, takes account of the experience and lessons of the past, and bases itself on the declaration adopted by the republic." The draft recongizes the sovereignty of the states belonging to the Union, the inalienable right of nations and peoples to self-determination and their free, democratic development.

Commenting on the decision, Sakhat Muradov said that the next stage of work on the text of the draft Union treaty should begin.

Various Kazakh Laws Published in Press

Law on Foreign Economic Activities

914A0541B

For the Law on Foreign Economic Activities published in the 17 January 1991 KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-015, pages 21-23.

Law on Consumer Cooperatives

914A0559A

For the Law on Consumer Cooperatives published in the 16 January 1991 KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-016, pages 17-20.

Law on Free Economic Zones

914A0519A

[Text]For the Law on Free Economic Zones published in the 23 January 1991 KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-016, pages 32-36.

Law on Foreign Investment

914A0542A

[Text]For the Law on Foreign Investment published in the 17 January 1991 KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-016, pages 36-38.